



THE CITY COUNCIL OF CHICAGO

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

May 26, 1983  
2:00 o'clock p.m.

Council Chambers  
City Hall  
Chicago, Illinois

1                   MAYOR WASHINGTON: Council will come to order.  
2 Clerk, take the roll.

3                   THE CLERK: Roti?

4                   ALDERMAN ROTI: Here.

5                   THE CLERK: Rush?

6                   ALDERMAN RUSH: Here.

7                   THE CLERK: Kenner? Evans?

8                   ALDERMAN EVANS: Here.

9                   THE CLERK: Bloom?

10                  ALDERMAN BLOOM: Here.

11                  THE CLERK: Sawyer?

12                  ALDERMAN SAWYER: Here.

13                  THE CLERK: Beavers?

14                  ALDERMAN BEAVERS: Here.

15                  THE CLERK: Humes?

16                  ALDERMAN HUMES: Here.

17                  THE CLERK: Hutchinson?

18                  ALDERMAN HUTCHINSON: Here.

19                  THE CLERK: Vrdolyak?

20                  ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Here.

21                  THE CLERK: Huels?

22                  ALDERMAN HUELS: Here.

23                  THE CLERK: Majerczyk?

24                  ALDERMAN MAJERCZYK: Here.

1 THE CLERK: Madrzyk?

2 ALDERMAN MADRZYK: Here.

3 THE CLERK: Burke?

4 ALDERMAN BURKE: Here.

5 THE CLERK: Brady?

6 ALDERMAN BRADY: Here.

7 THE CLERK: Langford?

8 ALDERMAN LANGFORD: Here.

9 THE CLERK: Streeter?

10 ALDERMAN STREETER: Here.

11 THE CLERK: Kellam?

12 ALDERMAN KELLAM: Here.

13 THE CLERK: Sheahan?

14 ALDERMAN SHEAHAN: Here.

15 THE CLERK: Kelley?

16 ALDERMAN KELLEY: Here.

17 THE CLERK: Sherman?

18 ALDERMAN SHERMAN: Here.

19 THE CLERK: Stemberk?

20 ALDERMAN STEMBERK: Here.

21 THE CLERK: Krystyniak?

22 ALDERMAN KRYSTYNIAK: Here.

23 THE CLERK: Henry?

24 ALDERMAN HENRY: Here.

1 THE CLERK: Marzullo?

2 ALDERMAN MARZULLO: Here.

3 THE CLERK: Nardulli?

4 ALDERMAN NARDULLI: Here.

5 THE CLERK: Wallace Davis?

6 ALDERMAN WALLACE DAVIS: Here.

7 THE CLERK: Smith?

8 ALDERMAN SMITH: Here.

9 THE CLERK: Danny Davis?

10 ALDERMAN DANNY DAVIS: Here.

11 THE CLERK: Hagopian?

12 ALDERMAN HAGOPIAN: Here.

13 THE CLERK: Santiago?

14 ALDERMAN SANTIAGO: Here.

15 THE CLERK: Gabinski?

16 ALDERMAN GABINSKI: Here.

17 THE CLERK: Mell?

18 ALDERMAN MELL: Here.

19 THE CLERK: Frost?

20 ALDERMAN FROST: Here.

21 THE CLERK: Kotlarz?

22 ALDERMAN KOTLARZ: Here.

23 THE CLERK: Banks?

24 ALDERMAN BANKS: Here.

1 THE CLERK: Damato?

2 ALDERMAN DAMATO: Here.

3 THE CLERK: Cullerton?

4 ALDERMAN CULLERTON: Here.

5 THE CLERK: Laurino?

6 ALDERMAN LAURINO: Here.

7 THE CLERK: O'Connor?

8 ALDERMAN O'CONNOR: Here.

9 THE CLERK: Pucinski?

10 ALDERMAN PUCINSKI: Here.

11 THE CLERK: Natarus?

12 ALDERMAN NATARUS: Here.

13 THE CLERK: Oberman?

14 ALDERMAN OBERMAN: Here.

15 THE CLERK: Hansen?

16 ALDERMAN HANSEN: Here.

17 THE CLERK: McLaughlin?

18 ALDERMAN McLAUGHLIN: Here.

19 THE CLERK: Orbach?

20 ALDERMAN ORBACH: Here.

21 THE CLERK: Schulter?

22 ALDERMAN SCHULTER: Here.

23 THE CLERK: Volini?

24 ALDERMAN VOLINI: Here.

1 THE CLERK: Orr?

2 ALDERMAN ORR: Here.

3 THE CLERK: Stone?

4 ALDERMAN STONE: Here.

5 MAYOR WASHINGTON: There is a quorum present.

6 The President of the Council will pray.

7 Alderman Frost?

8 ALDERMAN FROST: Mr. President, members of the  
9 City Council, in view of that prayer, I renew the motions  
10 that I made earlier yesterday for us to resume as a  
11 Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Jobs  
12 Bill and the Community Development Block Grant.

13 MAYOR WASHINGTON: You heard the motion. All  
14 in favor say aye.

15 (Chorus of ayes.)

16 Opposed no.

17 (No response.)

18 Motion carried. Alderman Pucinski, will  
19 you take the Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: The meeting will come to  
21 order. We recessed yesterday as a Committee as a Whole in  
22 consideration of the New Development Block Grant Program and  
23 the Jobs Bill for 1983. Mr. Schulz was in the witness  
24 chair. It will not be necessary to swear him again.

1                   And the first member to be recognized this  
2 afternoon will be Alderman Bloom.

3                   ALDERMAN BLOOM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4                   CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Before you proceed,  
5 Mr. Bloom, if there are any other public witnesses that wish  
6 to be heard, please fill out one of these slips and give it  
7 to one of the gentlemen.

8 WHEREUPON:

9                   D A V I D   S C H U L Z  
10 recalled as a witness herein, having been first duly sworn  
11 on oath, was examined upon oral interrogatories and  
12 testified as follows:

13                   E X A M I N A T I O N

14                   by Alderman Bloom

15           Q.       Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16                   Mr. Schulz, I must say at the beginning  
17 that in my opinion if there was any doubt about your  
18 qualifications to assume the position to which your  
19 appointment has been submitted, there shouldn't be any doubt  
20 as a result of your prudent course of yesterday which I am  
21 sure will be carried over today.

22                   In a short period of time, you seem to  
23 have digested and really come to grips with the substantial  
24 issues of the two programs that we're talking about.

1                   To begin with, I wanted to clarify a few  
2 things. First of all, under the multi-family rehab program,  
3 is it correct to say that these funds for rehabilitation can  
4 be used for energy savings as well as other purposes?

5           A.       Yes, it is, Alderman, but generally the  
6 multi-unit rehabilitation systems and multi-unit systems  
7 have energy savings as part of a much larger rehabilitation  
8 effort.

9           Q.       Now, there was some question before about the  
10 capital improvements that are contemplated under these  
11 programs. My question to you may be a general one but if I  
12 may be more specific, from the time that approval is given  
13 to a particular project, let's make it a simple one like  
14 curbs at a particular location, until the time the work can  
15 be done, what would be the time gap?

16          A.       Alderman, obviously that time depends on the  
17 nature of the project. If there are interstate  
18 improvements, for example, there is a need -- Once it has  
19 been identified with a petition or a need expressed by a  
20 group of local businessman in an outlying business area of  
21 the City, they then approach the City's Department of  
22 Economic Development and deal with their need for physical  
23 improvements in their area.

24                   That then goes through a decision-making

1 process in terms of sort of getting them in line for a  
2 particular program funds, and that process includes a  
3 judgment as to the validity of their request; and then once  
4 their request is determined to be valid, there is a judgment  
5 made by the Commissioner of Economic Development that that  
6 project is beneficial enough to warrant the expenditure of  
7 funds for the design.

8           You go into the design process with the  
9 businessmen as participants and as reviewers of the design,  
10 and then once the design is completed, you go in  
11 construction. Depending upon the allocation of funds for a  
12 particular project, it can really be said to begin at the  
13 date or the program year when the design funds are  
14 authorized.

15           To pick a reasonable time for a design is  
16 probably 9 to 15 months, and then it takes another three to  
17 four months for the City to advertise, bid and award the  
18 contract.

19           Q.     That was really answering my question because  
20 even if you get down to something as mundane as curbing  
21 under a model block program, is it necessary to know the  
22 specific locations before it goes out to bid?

23           A.     We have in the past bid contracts without  
24 specific locations. As part of an overall contract where

1 there are specific locations, no, we don't tend to get the  
2 most favorable prices when we do that. The contractor  
3 generally likes to see exactly the area he is working in.  
4 But we do bid a lineal curb foot of curb and gutter on  
5 occasions.

6 Alderman, I point out that the Model Block  
7 Program which has been plagued by some problems in terms of  
8 its getting out was a multi-department program; that is, the  
9 Department of Planning worked with the people in the  
10 neighborhoods to identify the model blocks, then came up  
11 with a priority listing of model blocks, then turned that  
12 into a contract in cooperation with the Bureau of Streets.  
13 Both of those departments were fairly loaded.

14 The recommended program or final program  
15 provides for that program to be transferred to the  
16 Department of Public Works which will have responsibility  
17 for the selection, design, working with the neighborhoods,  
18 construction and bidding and contract administration. And  
19 we feel by this rule we're going to be able to consolidate  
20 the responsibility and comparability for that program in one  
21 department and, therefore, cut down -- Where we have  
22 problems in City government, the worst problems tend to be  
23 where there are multiple departments involved, as I'm sure  
24 you are aware.

1                   And when you go as an alderman to ask a  
2 commissioner, he says, no, it's the other guy's fault. When  
3 you get three commissioners, the solution is virtually  
4 beyond your grasp in terms of actually trying to find out  
5 whose accountable. We believe by making that change in the  
6 Model Block Program, we're going to try and speed up so that  
7 we can come in with all of the money for a particular year's  
8 program within that program year.

9                   Now, because of the shift in Year XIII  
10 when we began a program here on July 1st instead of October  
11 1st, I personally am hopeful that we will be able to get  
12 some of the Year IX model blocks under construction contract  
13 yet this construction season.

14           Q.       I see. I had a question with regard to the  
15 regulations, the Federal regulations under which the  
16 Community Development Block Grant Program is operating. I  
17 am referring to Part 570 of Section 570 307, Section F which  
18 says Community Development Program has been developed so as  
19 to give maximum feasible priority to activities which will  
20 benefit low and moderate income families or aid in the  
21 prevention or elimination of slums or blight. Is that still  
22 the law as far as you know?

23           A.       As far as I know, yes. I read a brief synopsis  
24 of that in my statement yesterday. But we believe that

1 that's currently applicable and there are a number of other  
2 criteria under that program.

3 Q. What jeopardy would we be facing if we approved  
4 projects that did not meet those requirements?

5 A. Alderman, the program as it's currently  
6 targeted is designed totally with the idea of targeting  
7 primarily for low and moderate income areas of the City.

8 I would point out that there are certain  
9 housing finance assistance and certain economic development  
10 activities that are really City-wide in nature and depends  
11 only on need, in certain cases on income criteria.

12 But if the program was shifted so that it  
13 were not targeted to the low and moderate income  
14 neighborhoods of the City, I think we would put ourselves in  
15 serious jeopardy with the Federal Government in terms of the  
16 continued availability of these funds to the City of  
17 Chicago.

18 Q. Thank you. With regard to those public  
19 improvement projects, I know with regard to the model blocks  
20 in the past, we have contracted out most of that work to  
21 private contractors. Is that your intention for the next  
22 Year IX?

23 A. We are currently -- As you know, there was a  
24 new Acting Commissioner of Streets and Sanitation appointed

1 only Monday. My office took over control of the finances of  
2 Streets and Sanitation a week ago Monday.

3 We are currently still sorting out what  
4 the problems are in regards to streets and sanitation, and I  
5 am aware that there was a significant number of City  
6 employees who were scheduled to be hired by the outgoing  
7 Administration as part of their summer hiring, especially in  
8 the area of curb and gutter and asphalt.

9 I am sensitive that these employees were  
10 put out of work and were not brought back to work; and  
11 before I would want to go back to the use of contract  
12 personnel or contractors for the expenditure of these funds,  
13 I would want to take a look and see exactly what the  
14 employee situation is.

15 If we can obtain the same quality of work  
16 and productivity in the Bureau of Streets from our in-house  
17 force account, curb and gutter and asphalt crews to do these  
18 projects -- and I am confident that we can -- then I think  
19 that there is nothing wrong with using these funds to  
20 support force account work in these areas. But simply it  
21 would be premature at this time to make that call.

22 But I want to be honest with you and tell  
23 you that we have under active consideration the possibility  
24 of using some of these funds to support operations in the

1 Bureau of Streets in the designated areas.

2 Q. The \$2.4 million for summer youth employment,  
3 the hiring will be done through which department?

4 A. The hiring will be done through the Department  
5 of Personnel as all City hiring will be done in the  
6 Department of Personnel.

7 Q. Previously there has been hiring done through  
8 other sources. Are you saying to us that that will not  
9 occur?

10 A. In my discussions with the Mayor and his staff,  
11 it has been made clear -- and with Dr. Pounian -- it has  
12 been made clear that all City hiring will be done through  
13 the 11th floor offices of the Department of Personnel. That  
14 not only goes for summer youth employment, that goes for all  
15 permanent City hiring as well.

16 Q. Thank you. Now, is it fair to say that the  
17 shift in personnel that you discussed in your statements  
18 yesterday was away from, in effect, office-type personnel  
19 and more concentrated in the employment in working blue  
20 collar and laboring type of jobs?

21 A. I think that's probably fair, Alderman. To  
22 elaborate, the shifts in City operations, which total  
23 approximately \$13.5 million that are contained in the final  
24 program, were not meant to say that any individual or any

1 program, any department was not providing a valuable service  
2 to the citizens of the City.

3 What we're saying was is that over the  
4 years, the amount of those -- the amount of community  
5 development block grant funds that were being devoted to  
6 City employees and City operations had increased to the  
7 point we felt that not enough of the money was getting  
8 through to physical improvements, development efforts,  
9 housing assistance and other programs in the neighborhoods.

10 We made a statement upon the release of  
11 this information Tuesday that we believe that it was in that  
12 effect of the shifts contained in the final program, there  
13 will be an increase in total employment in Chicago.

14 But you are correct in your assessment  
15 that this increase will come primarily in construction jobs  
16 for the physical improvements, for the housing  
17 rehabilitation, and for the other programs that we receive  
18 in these funds, and also hopefully stimulation of permanent  
19 jobs, commercial, industrial type of jobs that we would  
20 stimulate as a result of our increased funding for economic  
21 development activities.

22 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: You have one minute left,  
23 Mr. Alderman.

24 ALDERMAN BLOOM: I will ask one more question,

1 Mr. Chairman, and then reserve the right if I have anymore  
2 later.

3 Q. Can you compare the amount of the  
4 local option reserve under this grant application with the  
5 amount in prior years' applications under the prior  
6 Administration?

7 A. I only have at my fingertips, Alderman, the  
8 amount last year. Last year the original Year XIII  
9 allocation as passed on by this Council in authorizing the  
10 Mayor to apply was slightly over two and a half million, and  
11 the amount of funds was slightly less. So we're looking at  
12 a decrease of approximately 30, 35 percent in the amount --  
13 the absolute amount of funds, while there has been a slight  
14 increase in the program.

15 As I testified yesterday, I believe that  
16 the amount of local option funds which remains unchanged  
17 from the preliminary to the final program is an absolute  
18 minimum. We're talking about \$147 million worth of  
19 expenditures, and we're talking about less than \$2 million  
20 of money for local option.

21 And in order to meet unanticipated  
22 situations or to make minor reallocations of funds or  
23 expenditures of funds on emergency situations, I think that  
24 this is certainly a very modest -- in fact, it may be too

1 small.

2 Q. I think, Mr. Schulz, that you will find if you  
3 compare the prior years, that the amount of local option in  
4 your proposal is at least 50 percent less than was generally  
5 reserved by prior -- the prior Administration in its prior  
6 years. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Rush.

8 E X A M I N A T I O N

9 by Alderman Rush

10 Q. Thank you, Mr. Schulz. I want to congratulate  
11 you also on your appointment. I have a couple of concerns.  
12 One is on the economic development planning capital  
13 projects, and you have here -- I will take research park,  
14 750,000. Can you explain what the High Tech Research Park  
15 is?

16 A. Alderman, we don't have as yet details on High  
17 Tech Research Park. This was a commitment that was made  
18 under the previous Administration in development,  
19 cooperative development with the State of Illinois of a High  
20 Tech Research Park in the vicinity of the University of  
21 Illinois at Chicago.

22 The City, as I understand it, has  
23 committed to physically assemble parcels and to do physical  
24 improvements in this area. This is not a commitment that

1 has necessarily been renewed by the new Administration. It  
2 is simply a provision to continue the commitment that was  
3 made by the previous Administration subject to the new  
4 Administration's review.

5                   And as I am sure you are aware, we have  
6 had less than four weeks to deal with the reformation of the  
7 program. What I told you is as much information as I have  
8 off the top of my head. I will, however, ask Commissioner  
9 Aljavy of the Department of Economic Development to prepare  
10 a detailed description of the High Tech Research Park, and I  
11 will provide it to you and other members of the Council.

12           Q.       In terms of the 1992 Worlds Fair, are there any  
13 funds that could be generated under the CD portion -- of the  
14 CD that will be available for local community groups to  
15 provide some at least preliminary research activity on the  
16 1992 Worlds Fair?

17           A.       I believe, Alderman, that there are a variety  
18 of technical assistance areas in the Department of Economic  
19 Development and the Department of Housing and probably under  
20 the Department of Public Works that would be a potential for  
21 providing this type of technical assistance and support.  
22 And I would be happy to engage in a discussion with you and  
23 other interested aldermen of how we could put together a  
24 program to deal with that, the whole issue of Worlds Fair

1 planning.

2 Q. I will be contacting you on that. My next area  
3 of concern is are there any modernization funds available --  
4 currently available now at the Chicago Housing Authority?

5 I see here that you made a statement that  
6 modernization funds do not come in the final statements.  
7 Are there any available funds, modernization funds right now  
8 at the CHA?

9 A. The position of the Administration, Alderman,  
10 in deleting the CHA modernization funds from this program  
11 was that the CHA has a substantial backlog of modernization  
12 funds which it is not spending at the present time. The  
13 number that was quoted to me -- and I assume I'm remaining  
14 under oath from yesterday, so I will have to say that the  
15 number that was quoted to me was approximately \$98 million  
16 of an unspent backlog of modernization funds at the CHA.

17 And it was felt by the Administration that  
18 it was inappropriate to provide additional funding under  
19 community development block grants with that amount of  
20 modernization funds remaining unspent.

21 Clearly there are legal issues involved  
22 with releasing those funds to the CHA by the Federal  
23 Government, but again we -- The judgment was that it was  
24 inappropriate to release -- to provide further funding even

1 though that funding may be tied up. Basically, the position  
2 is that we would like the CHA to resolve the problem and  
3 move ahead and spend the money that they've already had  
4 allocated to them by the Federal Government for that  
5 program.

6 Q. Can you explain what some of the legal tie-ups  
7 are because the residents of public housing are hurting for  
8 those modernization funds; there are empty apartments all  
9 throughout the housing development projects, elevators are  
10 not operating, those funds are sort of needed? Can you  
11 explain what the legal ramifications are and what is your  
12 opinion on how soon that money will be released to the  
13 residents of public housing?

14 A. I apologize, Alderman, but I am not personally  
15 conversant with the problem. I believe it's tied up in a  
16 withdrawal case and that the CHA has to come up with a plan  
17 to satisfy those kinds of criteria before those funds will  
18 be available.

19 Q. I understand. I'm looking here at the public  
20 services -- Anyway you have under gang crime prevention, can  
21 you tell me -- That's about 600,000 plus more than it was  
22 last year.

23 Can you tell me what programs are you  
24 going to -- will that money pay for in terms of preventing

1 gang crime activity and whether or not you are satisfied  
2 with the level of that particular expenditure from last  
3 year's budget?

4 A. Alderman, a number of operating programs  
5 contained in this budget show apparent substantial  
6 increases; and the situation is that, as I mentioned before,  
7 in 1982 the City accelerated its Community Development Block  
8 Grant Program by three months; that is, it began Year  
9 XIII -- Year VII of its Community Development Block Grant  
10 Program on October 1st, 1981, and it began Year XIII on July  
11 1st, 1982.

12 What it contained in the Year VII  
13 allocation were funds for twelve months worth of programs.  
14 Therefore, Year XIII had only to provide for nine months  
15 worth of programs. And what we see under the gang crime, as  
16 we see in a number of other operational areas, is that the  
17 apparent increase is needed to provide for the maintenance  
18 of existing personnel. This is not a program increase.

19 In answer to your question what they do,  
20 the \$3,938,000 is to provide for approximately 100 officers  
21 of the Chicago Police Department who are on full-time patrol  
22 designed to suppress gang related crime.

23 And beyond that, the particulars of the  
24 program, I would be happy to put you in touch or you can

1 obviously call him yourself, Acting Superintendent Brady.  
2 But that is for 100 full-time police officers who are in the  
3 gang crimes unit, it pays their total salary, and that is  
4 the approximate level of the program as it was carried out.

5 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Excuse me, Alderman Rush,  
6 you have two minutes.

7 Ladies and gentlemen, it's very difficult  
8 for Alderman Rush to hear the testimony of the witness.

9 ALDERMAN RUSH: Q. Thank you. It's been  
10 published that the gang crime viewing would be dispanded and  
11 the gang crime activity of the police department will be  
12 taken over by the organized crime community. If that is a  
13 reality, if that becomes a reality, would this money -- how  
14 would this \$3 million be used in order to prevent gang crime  
15 activity and rising gang crime activity?

16 A. I don't believe that the Administration has had  
17 the opportunity to look at that situation in detail. I can  
18 conceive of at least two extreme alternatives; one under  
19 which the continued funding of gang crime suppression  
20 activities in the Chicago Police Department with Community  
21 Development Block Grant funds; the other under which we come  
22 back to the Council and identify these funds as available  
23 for reprograming because the Administration has made the  
24 judgment that the gang crime activities, if they are

1 transferred to another unit of the police department such as  
2 organized crime, can be paid for out of other sources,  
3 probably the corporate fund.

4                   This will be a major program decision, and  
5 under the discussions that we have been having, this would  
6 be the kind of decision we would come back with and consult  
7 the Council.

8           Q.       There is one final question. How much of the  
9 CD funds are targeted for administrative overhead and how  
10 much are targeted for program overhead?

11           A.       Alderman, I think to get a quick handle on  
12 that, if you turn to the second last page of this eight and  
13 a half by fourteen score card sheet, as I will be calling  
14 it, you will find the monies that is specifically earmarked  
15 for Planning and Administration in various departments of  
16 City government.

17                   And in the final program, it totals about  
18 \$7.6 million down from approximately 12.5 million in the  
19 preliminary program. But that really isn't the total -- I  
20 don't want to mislead you to say that that's the total  
21 overhead type costs, if you will. There are throughout the  
22 document individual programs which contain certain  
23 administrative and overhead type costs by a common  
24 definition.

1                   One of the purposes of the changes that  
2 were made from the preliminary to the final program was to  
3 make a substantial reduction in the amount of CD funds that  
4 were spent on overhead and administrative type activities,  
5 and I would be happy to try and get a better fix on it for  
6 you. But preliminarily I think if you look at the Planning  
7 and Administration, you get a good idea of funds that are  
8 pure Administration planning and overhead.

9           Q.     Thank you very much.

10           CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Laurino.

11                   E X A M I N A T I O N

12                   by Alderman Laurino

13           Q.     Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Schulz, I notice  
14 that Kiwanis Park located at 3300 on Carmen Avenue is  
15 scheduled to be rehabed under the UPARR park program. This  
16 park has been a very interesting site for the people in the  
17 community. There was always a gang problem there. Since  
18 then it was torn down. The neighbors are very upset.

19                   Sometime ago North Park College wanted to  
20 buy this piece of land. I think that would have been a good  
21 idea because it's been a big problem in that particular  
22 area.

23           A.     The funding provided under the Community  
24 Development Block Grant Program is \$1.3 million, that with a

1 \$3 million federal youth park grant for a total of 4.3  
2 million. The bulk of those funds are being passed through  
3 the City to the Chicago Park District.

4 The funding for the specific lots  
5 contained in this program is supplementary to funding that  
6 the Chicago Park District has committed under its recent  
7 Consent Decree to resolve a discrimination suit.

8 And so I am not responsible for the  
9 decision that was made in terms of the allocation of the  
10 funds to the specific park sites. But they were made. The  
11 sites that are specified are all named as sites to be  
12 improved by the Park District as part of the Consent Decree  
13 that they agreed to in the last couple of weeks.

14 Q. On Page 3, Mr. Schulz, you show a sum of  
15 \$700,000 for the project site at Lawrence and Pulaski. This  
16 has been going on for a couple of years and I have two  
17 questions on this site. One, what improvements are they  
18 going to do there, or is this to level the existing  
19 building?

20 A. I don't have the details on that, Alderman.  
21 The only thing I -- The only light I can shed on that is  
22 that the Lawrence and Pulaski acquisition and site  
23 improvement, which they tell me they want to finish the land  
24 acquisition and begin the physical site improvements. I

1 will be happy to get that information for you from the  
2 Department of Economic Development.

3 Q. Are the funds going to be used to buy up the  
4 existing building, Mr. Schulz?

5 A. I don't have the details on this particular  
6 commercial district project, Alderman. I will have to get  
7 them for you.

8 Q. I would appreciate that. On Page 3 you show  
9 300,000 for Lawrence and Kedzie. This is only one site  
10 improvement. Is your office or ADC working with the people  
11 in the community to find the best possible use of the site  
12 once it's ready for development?

13 A. Again the Commercial District Development  
14 Program is the responsibility of the Department of Economic  
15 Development. The indication under activity of site  
16 improvement indicates that there will be physical site  
17 improvements; sewer, sidewalk, curb and gutter, streets and  
18 whatever as they're needed, public type of improvements.

19 And I will get that information for you  
20 from the Commissioner of Economic Development regarding the  
21 proposed program for Year IX.

22 Q. And on the last page, you show a total of  
23 \$387,135 for the project Kedzie and Ainslie. Which project  
24 is this? I know there is a senior citizens home. Is that

1 the one you are talking about or is it a new project or what  
2 is that?

3 A. The last sheet comes from the Department of  
4 Housing, and it is their planned breakdown of expenditures  
5 for residential urban renewal activities during Year IX.

6 And again as with the commercial district  
7 other than the breakdown of the budget which shows that the  
8 bulk of the money is set aside for acquisition, I don't have  
9 anymore details than that. I would be happy to inquire for  
10 you with the Commissioner of Housing and provide details on  
11 that project to you.

12 Q. Well, if it's the existing building,  
13 Mr. Schulz, what would they do with the money that's left  
14 because that home is practically built now?

15 A. Alderman, I am just not familiar with the  
16 details of that project. I will try and get some detailed  
17 information to you from the Housing Department.

18 Q. I appreciate that, thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman O'Connor.

20 E X A M I N A T I O N

21 by Alderman O'Connor

22 Q. Mr. Schulz, we have never met before your  
23 appearance yesterday, but I would like to commend you on  
24 your testimony. It shows you have a good grasp of what you

1 are doing and the documents are very good.

2 I have a couple questions along the lines  
3 that Alderman Beavers and Alderman Santiago had yesterday;  
4 the first being you had stated yesterday that you don't have  
5 a breakdown of a ward by ward expenditure at this time.

6 Do you anticipate that you are going to  
7 prepare such documents; and if so, how often will you do  
8 that?

9 A. I don't currently anticipate that my office  
10 will prepare a ward by ward breakdown of --

11 Q. Why is that?

12 A. Because, Alderman, I'm prepared -- I shared  
13 with the members of the Council yesterday a breakdown for  
14 those programs where there has been a tentative allocation  
15 of funds by the implementing departments; and as we proceed  
16 to go into the program here and as the other projects are  
17 allocated, we will be providing that information.

18 Q. That's what I am asking you. If this project  
19 is not known, will you be providing us with a ward by ward  
20 breakdown?

21 A. We have agreed as part of the negotiations that  
22 are taking place parallel to this proceeding --

23 Q. I am familiar with the negotiations, I know  
24 what you agreed to in them. I am asking do you anticipate

1 making a ward by ward breakdown so 50 aldermen can know  
2 what's going into their ward or not?

3 A. The answer is I do not plan to do so at the  
4 present time.

5 Q. Now, specifically referring to your document on  
6 the Jobs Bill, and I understand this came from a prior  
7 Administration, talking of private facility renovation, the  
8 language that says not-for-profit organization owned  
9 facilities are -- or will be eligible for those funds.

10 Under that definition, does that mean that  
11 those not-for-profit corporations must own the building  
12 they're in, does a lease suffice, or how is that going to be  
13 determined?

14 A. Alderman, as I indicated yesterday, we funded  
15 these three projects in Year XIII. Year XIII was the first  
16 year this was done. We funded two WMCA projects and church  
17 projects.

18 Although it says nonprofit owned  
19 facilities, I would be prepared to work with the appropriate  
20 department heads to implement language to allow persons to  
21 be made to lease space as long as we could have assurance  
22 that we could amortize the cost of the improvements over the  
23 term of the lease.

24 Q. You stated yesterday that you have a number of

1 applications for these funds already. Are you going to  
2 limit -- and the applications number exceeded the amount of  
3 money you had available. Are you going to limit the  
4 applications at this point to only those you received, or  
5 are you still allowing applications to come in?

6 A. I stated yesterday that we had approximately \$3  
7 million worth of applications for the \$1 million. In spite  
8 of that, I am not personally satisfied that sufficient  
9 information was gotten into the hands of all private  
10 nonprofit organizations in the City to make them aware of  
11 the availability of these funds; and, therefore, we would be  
12 prepared to entertain additional applications.

13 This is one of the areas where we will be  
14 developing detailed expenditure criteria and ward criteria,  
15 and I think it would be appropriate as part of that process  
16 to make all of our nonprofit agencies, put them on an even  
17 basis, so the answer is, yes, we will.

18 Q. Is there a deadline as to when this  
19 organization would have to have been existent, or could  
20 someone start one up tomorrow and still be recognized and  
21 their application went in?

22 A. Clearly, Alderman, one of the criteria that  
23 will be used to evaluate has to be the organization's track  
24 record in terms of being in business.

1           Q.     Fine, thank you. In your opening statement  
2 yesterday, there was some categories referring to small  
3 programs from the public safety, the law department and the  
4 library being cut out, and that the funds for these sources  
5 will come from more appropriate sources. Can you identify  
6 those sources for me, please?

7           A.     I will go through the three programs. I don't  
8 have my statement immediately in front of me. The  
9 Department of Public Safety we're talking about  
10 approximately \$180,000 worth of an arson prevention program.

11                     I indicated in the supplementary  
12 information that I provided to the members of the Council  
13 late Tuesday afternoon that that -- this program will be  
14 transferred to the Chicago Police Department where we expect  
15 or anticipate that because the police department already has  
16 an active arson investigation function, they will absorb the  
17 computerized arson investigation function currently  
18 undertaken by the Department of Public Safety at some  
19 increase in efficiency, and I estimated that impact on the  
20 corporate funds, I believe, at approximately \$100,000.

21                     The Chicago Public Library Program --

22           Q.     Mr. Schulz, that's dollar amounts. What I am  
23 looking for is can you just identify the sources?

24           A.     The Library Program would be again an

1 efficiency that we anticipate, but it will be from the  
2 library funds. And in the Law Department, we don't  
3 anticipate any impact. We believe those funds can be  
4 absorbed within the normal operations of the City of Chicago  
5 Law Department.

6 Q. Thank you. Now, as to the parks, certain of  
7 the parks are going to be funded, I believe you said it's  
8 going to be a total of 4.5 million; is that correct?

9 A. 4.3 million.

10 Q. Okay. You have specific parks noted in your  
11 report. Do you have specific dollar amounts where you know  
12 what you're going to spend in those parks? Who is going to  
13 oversee what's put in there because there could be a  
14 short-fall or there could be an excess; and if so, who will  
15 oversee that function, the Park District or the City of  
16 Chicago?

17 A. The Park District will oversee that function.  
18 We are making a grant application on behalf of the Park  
19 District. Again I would point out that these funds are in  
20 addition to funds that they committed to from a Consent  
21 Decree.

22 Q. What I am saying is if there is an excess, say  
23 a park is budgeted for \$20,000 and a small playground  
24 doesn't use that, where does that money go? Is it going to

1 be put back in the City, does it stay in the park budget?

2 A. I believe under this program, it would probably  
3 be reallocated to other parks on the list where there would  
4 be a short-fall.

5 Q. Do you know if there is a supplemental list for  
6 parks if there is an excess, or have you not gotten that  
7 far?

8 A. We just haven't gotten to that point, Alderman.  
9 I think we would probably be constrained to spend these  
10 monies on the roster or parks we got here unless we could  
11 demonstrate to the Federal Government that we were able to  
12 accomplish all that the Park District and we on their behalf  
13 can claim we would do with the funds that were available.

14 Q. This is my point. What I am asking is is there  
15 a breakdown as to what is to be done park by park?

16 A. The application was prepared in a very short  
17 period of time. We have got some typical type of  
18 information; but to answer your question, I don't believe  
19 there is a specific dollar amount allocated to each of these  
20 park sites.

21 Q. Turning to the document itself, just to the  
22 policy the document puts forward, from my examination of the  
23 document and your testimony from yesterday and today, I'm  
24 unsure as to what dollar amount of this Community

1 Development Block Grant and Jobs Bill is not specifically  
2 spoken for.

3 Can you tell me what amount of the funds,  
4 if any, are not earmarked for one specific area but are  
5 designated for a specific category? In other words, you  
6 have a category but you don't have it specified as to what  
7 site. Can you give me those breakdowns?

8 A. Okay. I did some preliminary numbers  
9 yesterday, Alderman. In the category of housing --

10 Q. No, just for the whole budget, how much is in  
11 the category but not site specific and how much is not?

12 A. Okay. Approximately \$55.8 million is site  
13 specific without having sites yet determined. Approximately  
14 \$22.0 million is site specific where those sites are  
15 determined, and that is the information that I provided to  
16 the Council that you are referring to, and approximately  
17 \$14.3 million is nonsite specific covering the entire City.

18 Q. Now, the whole package, can you tell me what  
19 funds, according to this program, are or could be designated  
20 as discretionary funds in that they could be shifted from  
21 one category to another or not applied to any specific  
22 category at this time?

23 A. At this time, the funds are all allocated  
24 except the approximately 1.8 million in local option. And

1 you have indicated that you are aware that we're entering  
2 into discussions with the Council outside of these  
3 proceedings, and we are prepared -- the Administration is  
4 prepared to, in essence, pledge itself --

5 Q. Mr. Schulz, I am not asking you to jeopardize  
6 those negotiations, if you don't mind. I am just saying is  
7 there a specific dollar amount you are aware of right now as  
8 you sit there?

9 A. The only funds that are really free in the  
10 program in the sense of not allocated to any particular  
11 project category is the 1.8 million local option. But I  
12 would point out that under the Federal regulations which  
13 govern this program, the City has considerable flexibility  
14 to move funds from one project category to the other.

15 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman, you have two more  
16 minutes.

17 MR. O'CONNOR: Q. Okay. Yesterday you stated  
18 that you were willing to prepare reports on a quarterly  
19 basis, if I am correct, as to where the money went.

20 Do you anticipate that you will be  
21 preparing a quarterly report as to where you think the money  
22 will go so that we get two reports every three months; one  
23 that indicates where it went and one that indicates where  
24 the next quarter is going to be going?

1           A.       The quarterly report I will prepare for members  
2 of the Council will include both the current status of the  
3 program in terms of any changes that have been made to the  
4 project categories as prospectively as well as expenditure  
5 reports on how the funds have been spent, what percentage  
6 have been allocated.

7           Q.       Thank you very much.

8           CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Danny Davis.

9                   E X A M I N A T I O N

10                  by Alderman Danny Davis

11          Q.       Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Schulz, I just  
12 want to reiterate the commendation that you already received  
13 from my colleagues in reference to your appointment. I am  
14 certainly delighted and confident that you are going to do  
15 an excellent job.

16                  I only have a couple questions. Alderman  
17 O'Connor mentioned several agencies that were going to be  
18 eliminated through CD funding. One of those is the Chicago  
19 Health Systems Agency. Is there anywhere where we can  
20 expect to get the home-grown support for other agencies?

21          A.       Alderman, in Year XIII -- Let me get my numbers  
22 here. Alderman, Community Development Block Grant funds  
23 were provided for the Chicago Health Systems Agency as  
24 supplementary funding to other sources of funding.

1                   And it's my understanding that they  
2 currently receive a \$750,000 Federal grant directly to  
3 Health Systems Planning. The Health Systems Agency has a  
4 Proceed Administration on previous years and asked for  
5 supplementary Community Development Block Grant funds with  
6 the explanation that they have somehow overrun their budget  
7 or they were anticipating new sources of funds and they  
8 needed some funds to tide them over.

9                   And for this purpose, \$257,000 was  
10 provided to the agency during this program year. And I  
11 discussed this matter on Monday with Director Davis, and I  
12 indicated that we were at the point here that we were being  
13 asked to buy into permanent continued funding of the Chicago  
14 Health Systems Agency. I indicated to the Director that we  
15 did not believe that this was an appropriate use of funds.

16                   So we're not talking about the total  
17 termination of the Health Systems Agency, but we're talking  
18 about not funding them with Community Development Block  
19 Grants.

20           Q.       My question is are we looking for any other  
21 sources of revenue that might be had especially given the  
22 reduction in size of the resources that they have?

23           A.       I am prepared to work with Director Davis and  
24 members of the Chicago Health Systems Agency to attempt to

1 identify other sources of funding, but I reiterate that we  
2 do not believe that this program should have a continued  
3 ongoing Community Development Block Grant Funding.

4           When they came into the Community  
5 Development Block Grant Funding the first time, it was on  
6 the basis it was an emergency, one time only need, and that  
7 has somehow evolved into the feeling that they are due  
8 continuous support, and I personally do not concur with that  
9 feeling, and clearly the Administration does not either  
10 given there was no funding included for that in the final  
11 program.

12           But, yes, I will work with them to  
13 identify any and all sources of outside funding to allow  
14 that important function, by the way. There is no question  
15 about the importance of the function. The question is what  
16 is the appropriate way to pay for it.

17           Q.     No matter what we do, I know we spend a great  
18 deal of effort trying to make sure that as many community  
19 groups become involved with the process, but yet it seems as  
20 though there are always those that somehow or another feel  
21 they didn't have the information or didn't get the  
22 information in time.

23           Have we begun to think about Year X and  
24 what the process will be and how people can certainly plug

1 into that so that they don't come up at the last minute  
2 wondering why they didn't get in, how they got this and how  
3 they got that?

4 A. First of all, Alderman, in response to the  
5 question from Alderman O'Connor, I indicated that I would  
6 not consider applications to be closed for the private  
7 facility renovation program.

8 I will certainly be in discussion with the  
9 commissioners of City departments who will receive funding  
10 under this program to pass on to so-called thirty party or  
11 delegate agencies. And I will indicate to them that because  
12 of the transition of the new Administration, I will expect  
13 them to entertain applications from delegate agencies and  
14 third-party private nonprofit service providers as well.

15 So that basically I am going to start off  
16 by saying that Year IX is not closed yet; that if those  
17 social service providers, housing providers, economic  
18 development corporations who have not been funded directly,  
19 it's specified in this document, still have an opportunity  
20 to compete for funds that have been allocated to specific  
21 departments.

22 Now, in response to your question on  
23 Year X, the City of Chicago will undertake a series of  
24 monitor hearings in the Fall, and we will essentially,

1 subject to some review, go through the process for Year X  
2 beginning shortly after the Christmas holidays.

3 I sat through those hearings in the past  
4 when I worked for the Department of Public Works. There is  
5 a clear-cut process for a public advertisement, public  
6 notice, public hearing, application for funds. We will be  
7 taking a look at that. There will be a detailed examination  
8 of the criteria employed by the Administration in  
9 consultation with the Council in terms of the awarding of  
10 third party delegate agency contracts.

11 During the upcoming remainder of 1983, we  
12 are positioned to take a look at that process in a very  
13 close scrutiny in cooperation with the Council; so,  
14 therefore, I would expect that there would be an amended set  
15 of guidelines that will emerge from that process which will  
16 guide the applications for Year X.

17 So we have begun some thinking on it. I  
18 think that the process as it's currently used -- Clearly,  
19 Alderman, I don't believe that there is any dispute with  
20 public advertisement notice that's given to this program and  
21 the application process that goes on. I think there may be  
22 some dispute in terms of how the applications are treated  
23 once they have been received.

24 But if you have specific suggestions for

1 how to open up the processing further to invite further  
2 competition for these dollars, I would be happy to entertain  
3 them.

4 Q. Thank you very much. Let me just -- on  
5 yesterday on the question from Alderman Smith, he raised a  
6 question about the possibility of minority set-aside  
7 programs in terms of contracting out some of the work.

8 I would just want to reinforce that and  
9 also commend your response in terms of suggesting that you  
10 would certainly take a hard look at that and if no such  
11 program currently exists, that you would seriously be in the  
12 process of developing one. I want to thank you very much.

13 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Are there any other members  
14 that have not had a chance to question the witness on the  
15 first go-around who wish to be heard at this time? If not,  
16 Mr. Burke.

17 E X A M I N A T I O N

18 by Alderman Burke

19 Q. Mr. Schulz, this flow chart indicates an  
20 increase, a tremendous increase in the category of housing,  
21 and it appears that you are proposing to spend about  
22 \$19,700,000, an increase of almost \$10 million over the  
23 proposal which was finalized in the most recent program.

24 My question to you is this: The problem

1 with energy in Chicago is perhaps one of the most pressing  
2 and important issues that we face today, especially in view  
3 of the fact that we can expect that the president of the gas  
4 company's remarks are to be taken as accurate, at least a 10  
5 percent increase in the gas bills for each of the next four  
6 years.

7                   Now, how much of this money, which I  
8 believe is categorized as multi-unit rehab assistance and  
9 multi-unit systems repair, do you propose to allocate for  
10 energy conservation; that is, upgrading furnaces or  
11 providing assistance for insulating dwelling units or  
12 installing or improving heating systems?

13           A.       It's difficult to make a precise quantitative  
14 answer to the question. We believe that there is a need for  
15 increase to public subsidy of public financing of housing  
16 activities especially as they're associated, obviously, with  
17 rehab.

18                   The funding that's available is available  
19 to developers to rehabilitate multi-unit structures and in  
20 so doing, they rehabilitate structural, mechanical and  
21 insulation and a variety of other types of activities. So  
22 that clearly energy conservation, installation of more  
23 efficient heating plan and insulation is an eligible and  
24 encouraged activity in the program.

1 But it's impossible for me to give you a  
2 breakdown in terms of the percentage of the 14 and a half  
3 million or 2.3 million for Chicago emergency assistance that  
4 is spent for these type of activities.

5 I would be happy to ask the Commissioner  
6 of Housing to research the records and determine  
7 historically how much money has been spent in these types of  
8 activities.

9 I point out that there is a new program,  
10 single unit duplex rehabilitation assistance, which we are  
11 proposing as part of the middle income residents in the City  
12 of Chicago who we feel have not had an opportunity to share  
13 perhaps as fully in the City assisted housing finance  
14 programs as others; in this case, low and moderate income.

15 We have not structured that program, and I  
16 can conceive of a variety of alternatives ranging from  
17 interest breakdown to using this as a reserve or a  
18 rehabilitation bond program to direct grants, and certainly  
19 we will also consider energy conservation as an activity  
20 there.

21 But I will get the information from the  
22 Commissioner and forward it to you.

23 Q. Are you aware that the Illinois Commerce  
24 Commission has ordered the Gas Company to come forth with an

1 energy conservation plan to be made available to the  
2 customers of Peoples Gas?

3 A. I am not aware of that.

4 Q. Do you see the wisdom of trying to provide some  
5 of this money to fund an energy conservation plan?

6 A. Absolutely, there is no question about it.

7 Q. Wouldn't you think perhaps it would be  
8 advisable to make this Energy Conservation Program of the  
9 Illinois Commerce Commission to effect the plan done by the  
10 Gas Company to be contingent on the City making some of  
11 these CD funds available; could we urge the Gas Company to  
12 make some of these funds available to match on a three or  
13 four month basis?

14 A. That would be a way -- certainly that would be  
15 a way to leverage these funds against the proper utility.  
16 We would certainly be happy to sit down and talk about it.  
17 Appears to be promise.

18 Q. Another question for you: You discussed  
19 briefly yesterday the Environmental Lead Program with the  
20 Board of Health. Well, I am lead to believe that the  
21 Environmental Lead Program within the Board of Health is  
22 funded to the extent of \$552,000. I see in your flow charts  
23 that you indicate that the Environmental Lead Program in the  
24 Health Department is funded to the extent of, I believe,

1 \$636,566 for Year VIII.

2 The Health Department presently is  
3 allocated \$552,000, of which \$446,000 is personal services.

4 Can you tell me how that Environmental  
5 Lead Program can continue to be maintained if, as you  
6 propose in your plan, \$452,000 is deleted therefrom?

7 A. The action that is implicit in the final  
8 program allocation of 452,000 is that the blood testing and  
9 health monitoring function -- it's a two-part program,  
10 Alderman. They monitor susceptible or suspect individuals,  
11 Health Commission, through their blood tests and other kinds  
12 of health screening activities. And there is a building  
13 inspection function that goes along with it.

14 The \$452,000 allocation compared with last  
15 year's \$636,000 in the Department of Health is meant to  
16 maintain sufficient resources within the Health Department  
17 to allow them to continue their health screening function.  
18 The Department of Inspectional Services has been asked to  
19 absorb the building inspection function as part of their  
20 normal building inspection operations.

21 And I estimated in the narrative, to  
22 translate to the Council, that that would have a net impact  
23 total of something on the order of a quarter million,  
24 \$250,000, on the corporate budget of the Health Department.

1 Q. Well, I must remark, Mr. Schulz, that I think  
2 you are being overly optimistic about the billing of these  
3 programs, like this program, to be maintained at this  
4 funding level. But, apparently, that remains to be seen.

5 Have we reduced the proposal or proposed  
6 budget deficit again today?

7 I understand now we're down to 74 million;  
8 is that right?

9 A. Alderman, I am waiting to come before the  
10 Council for my confirmation and I trust to lay it all out at  
11 that time. The next fifty million will not be as easy as  
12 the fifty million that we reduced it by yesterday.

13 CHAIRMAN PUCINKSI: Thank you. Ladies and  
14 gentlemen, I'd like to just call your attention to the fact  
15 that we have a very large number of citizens that would like  
16 to be heard this afternoon. So, on the second go around  
17 please confine your remarks.

18 I would like to recognize Alderman Wallace  
19 Davis.

20 E X A M I N A T I O N

21 By Alderman Wallace Davis

22 ALDERMAN W. DAVIS: Q. Mr. Schulz, I'd like to  
23 advise you for that period about the \$93,000 that is now  
24 being held in default for remodernizing CHA housing. It

1 seems that at this particular time I'm concerned about  
2 accomplice it need of that\*\*\*\*\* I'd like to get more  
3 clarification of where in the proposition in that number  
4 stand now and where is it is in the money of the <KPWOFT> at  
5 this point in time now.

6       A.     As indicated, Alderman, in my response to  
7 Alderman Rush, I am not personally conversant with the  
8 detailed status of the legal problems of the CHA. I would  
9 be happy, on your behalf, to contact Chairman Mooney and ask  
10 him to provide me and you with an updated status report of  
11 where he stands. But the basic understanding upon which the  
12 financing decision is based was that the CHA has close to  
13 \$100 million of modernization funds which are tied up and  
14 that to put more money on top of that money did not appear  
15 to be a prudent use of these scarce funds at this time.

16       Q.     My second question has the building that's been  
17 done of the proposed million dollars of federal funds which  
18 in my area that building is very hazardous and unsafe. It  
19 appears that our building is being used as {being|can} heat  
20 necessary.

21               When this money is available, how is it  
22 going to be trickled down to these various wards?

23       A.     The total allocation for demolition of  
24 hazardous buildings is \$1.5 million, Alderman. This is

1 clearly an inadequate amount to take care of the problem as  
2 that problem is citywide. And there are choices that must  
3 be made between the demolition of major buildings. For  
4 example, the U.S. Tobacco Complex on Roosevelt which they --  
5 if the City chooses to demolish that building, it is my  
6 understanding that that would use all the money simply to do  
7 that.

8 And there are a variety of other buildings  
9 around the City of the \$500, \$400, \$300,000 category. In  
10 addition, there is a variety of three-story commercial  
11 buildings, as well as the many residential buildings, that  
12 are problems to correct.

13 As this program is currently administered,  
14 it is under the discretion of the Commissioner of Special  
15 Services who pursues the program in cooperation with the Law  
16 Department. This is a program on which the new  
17 administration intends to develop programs, specific  
18 criteria for eligibility and for the use of these funds.  
19 But beyond that, the funds are used on an as needed basis at  
20 the discretion of the Commissioner of Inspectional Services,  
21 as he consults with the Corporation Counsel.

22 Q. My third and final question. First of all, the  
23 CD fund, the Block Programs, is the CHA housing in terms of  
24 senior citizens, whereas that security is needed very badly

1 in that particular area, and I certainly am familiar in  
2 terms of gang crime units to ask you to that spell it out to  
3 me in terms of where you need policemen, policeman who is  
4 off duty or would be allowed at these particular sites?

5 A. There is really two parts to your question,  
6 Alderman. The response to the latter part first, the gang  
7 crimes, that is one which -- that provides for the salary of  
8 approximately one hundred full-time police officers. That  
9 is, there intended salary of the entire cost to the City of  
10 employing those people is included, as well as support  
11 services vehicles and whatsoever for gang crime enforcement.

12 In addition, the final program contains \$3  
13 million for CHA security. That money never really goes to  
14 the CHA. That money is utilized by the Chicago Police  
15 Department under a hire back program, whereby officers are  
16 hired back and they're paid to work on off days and overtime  
17 to provide security within CHA buildings, including senior  
18 citizen buildings. That service is provided systemwide  
19 within the Authority.

20 Q. My last and final question that I will ask:  
21 That employment is very effective in my area, which is a  
22 sixty percent unemployment rate. And through the Block  
23 Program, what, in fact, that Block Grant could produce is  
24 some trickle down that percentage point in terms of areas of

1 unemployment.

2           A.       Clearly, unemployment is a problem in many  
3 neighborhoods of Chicago. The specific answer is that we  
4 made provision for contingent summer youth employment  
5 program in the Department of Streets and Sanitation that  
6 will employ low income unemployed youth. But, I think there  
7 is a broader answer to your question, Alderman.

8                       That is, as we make the painful shifts of  
9 funds from City operations, as we report to turning back on  
10 the number of the City employees, we believe that the net  
11 effect will be an increase in employment in the City of  
12 Chicago. Because we are talking about shifting funds from  
13 City operations to physical improvements, housing and  
14 rehabilitation, economic development activities which not  
15 only will generate construction jobs in the short-term but,  
16 in the case of economic development activities, hopefully  
17 will generate permanent jobs in the long term.

18                      So while I cannot point to a large number  
19 of specific programs that are designed to take immediate  
20 care of significant unemployment in wards like yours, I can  
21 say that the emphasis of the program and the idea behind the  
22 program is to increase employment and expect to increase it  
23 by getting the volume into the neighborhoods where it can  
24 employ construction workers and result in the stimulation of

1 new jobs with the retention of existing jobs in such a way  
2 that we believe -- the administration believes that this  
3 allocation of funds will result in more jobs in the City of  
4 Chicago, that the allocation that was contained in the  
5 preliminary program.

6 Q. Thank you very much, Mr. Schulz.

7 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Natarus.

8 E X A M I N A T I O N

9 By Alderman Natarus

10 Q. I just have two questions. There was placed in  
11 our box in the last few days a press release concerning the  
12 Emergency Food Fund in the Department of Human Services, of  
13 which there is an indication that they need \$3.2 million.  
14 And I notice that they do allocate one and a half million  
15 dollars in programs.

16 Is there any -- do you know of any way  
17 that we can make-up that short fall? Do you recognize such  
18 a need?

19 A. Alderman, I had some discussion on this  
20 yesterday.

21 Q. Yes, I know about it. I didn't know how large  
22 the short fall was. The short fall is about \$1.7 million.

23 A. The City of Chicago, the previous  
24 administration stated that no eligible person has ever been

1 turned away from the City of Chicago food pantry on the  
2 basis that there was not food available, with the possible  
3 exception of when there was a transportation problem. In  
4 other words, we have never run out of money in the program.  
5 We have discussed this with the Mayor. And, clearly, the  
6 current administration has asked to continue that policy.

7 Now, Commissioner Cartwright has identified a  
8 situation whereby she will have totally obligated all of the  
9 funds for the program by next Wednesday. And she currently  
10 projects that her department will be out of the emergency  
11 food packages by the first of July.

12 What we have done is to pursue a variety  
13 of areas. One is that we put \$1.5 million into the  
14 Community Development Block Grant Program, for the period  
15 starting July 1st, to make sure that food parcels on an  
16 emergency basis are available to the citizens of Chicago in  
17 an uninterrupted fashion.

18 Second, we got into discussion with the  
19 Illinois Department of Public Aid and Director Miller to  
20 determine if we can bring additional surplus food  
21 commodities of all types into the Chicago area. There have  
22 been available only institutional products. With doing  
23 that, those discussions are ongoing now.

24 Third, there have been discussions with

1 the Chicago Food Depository, a member of the project food  
2 pantries throughout the City. And we have indicated to the  
3 Chicago Food Depository that we would be prepared to  
4 negotiate a contract for the depository to provide the  
5 emergency food packages to the City, instead of City  
6 assembling them itself.

7                   Currently, the components of the food  
8 packages cost the City of Chicago approximately twenty  
9 dollars per box. And representatives of the depository have  
10 made a preliminary indication to the members of my staff  
11 that we can get better, perhaps fresh food, as opposed to  
12 the dry good staples that are included at the present time  
13 for as much as half of that. And so, it would clearly be a  
14 way to provide better food to the people who are forced to  
15 use this type of food and at the same time to get it at a  
16 cheaper cost for the City of Chicago.

17                   So, we are pursuing a variety of avenues  
18 to address what we -- I am sure your concern is a political  
19 problem that faces us in a sum of work of recession in the  
20 City of Chicago, and we are attempting to do that. But let  
21 me reemphasize, in a long answer with a short question, that  
22 the administration remains committed that no eligible  
23 individual will be turned away for lack of funds of this  
24 program. We will do what we have to do to meet that

1 commitment.

2 Q. Now, getting back to the topic of vaulted  
3 sidewalks, there is a requirement, I believe, that in order  
4 for you to meet the developing money, the area must be  
5 designated as residential. And there is an indication that  
6 the reason the designation is residential, there is a  
7 feeling as a matter of policy, I believe there are some  
8 ordinances to the effect that when it comes to adjoining  
9 commercial properties that the property owner appeal the  
10 commercial establishment that has a license with the City of  
11 Chicago is legally liable or obligated to repair the vault.

12 The only difficulty with that explanation that  
13 I can give is the fact that the City does not go out, as a  
14 matter of policy, and enforce the ordinances or force the  
15 commercial establishment to fix the vault. In fact, I don't  
16 know of a single lawsuit that's ever been filed on the part  
17 of the City of Chicago against any business person for  
18 failure to do so.

19 Now, how are we going to resolve this  
20 problem when we don't enforce the ordinance?

21 A. One of the real problems in the area of vaulted  
22 sidewalks, Alderman, is a real lack of consistency of policy  
23 to attempt to deal with the problem, a problem so massive  
24 that many City departments and many City personnel simply

1 shrug their shoulders and tend to ignore it.

2 I have personally been involved in trying  
3 to turn that policy around, I believe with some success.  
4 But we have got a long way to go. In the area of emergency  
5 vaulted sidewalk repair, what you say is true. That is,  
6 that we have established criteria under which the Emergency  
7 Repair Fund, a half million dollars last year which has been  
8 tripled to a million and a half dollars in the program,  
9 would only be used in this residential area.

10 I point out that the City Code is quite  
11 clear on that and has been asserted a number of times  
12 indicates that any property owner in the City of Chicago is  
13 responsible for the proper maintenance and repair of the  
14 vaulted sidewalk in front of his or her property. As a  
15 matter of practicality, however, the vaulted sidewalks tend  
16 to occur in older and, in certain cases, lower income  
17 neighborhoods of the City of Chicago.

18 And, therefore, it has been impossible for  
19 the City to aggressively enforce the policy forcing these  
20 property owners to maintain these vaults at a time when that  
21 could tend to discourage home ownership in these areas. So  
22 we are caught in a tough situation.

23 We have used the program guidelines to  
24 stay away from commercial areas because it was believed that

1 the commercial property owners, who have the same  
2 responsibility as the residential property owners, perhaps  
3 have more means to affect proper maintenance and repair.

4 Certainly your suggestion is well taken  
5 that the City, through its normal code enforcement policies,  
6 could aggressively pursue those commercial property owners  
7 who do not see fit to keep their vaulted sidewalks in a good  
8 state of repair.

9 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman, you have one more  
10 minute.

11 Q. What are we going to do if nothing happens?  
12 What if we have an emergency situation in a commercial area?  
13 What are we going to do, wait for somebody to get killed?

14 A. If there is an emergency situation in a  
15 commercial area, I am prepared to consult with the  
16 Commissioner of Streets and Sanitation to administer this  
17 program and direct it to be taken care of, that the property  
18 owner be billed on a reimburseable basis.

19 Q. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you. Alderman Humes.

21 ALDERMAN HUMES: Mr. Chairman, part of what I  
22 wanted to ask Dave was the removal of modernization funds  
23 and I think that was covered under Alderman Rush.

24 E X A M I N A T I O N

1 By Alderman Humes

2 Q. And also, to really clarify here that what  
3 we're talking about now not developed really programatically  
4 on site specific happens to be \$55 million of this grant; is  
5 that correct.

6 A. The numbers that I gave you, Alderman, is that  
7 it is \$55.8 million of the grant will eventually go to site  
8 specific projects for which sites have not yet been  
9 determined. That's correct.

10 Q. And so that's part of the application. The  
11 other question that I have is in regard to during the  
12 process of the hearing, statements, for instance for my  
13 area, I filed a statement with the officers who were at the  
14 hearing. Now, as a result of that hearing, it should occur  
15 that especially as it relates to playlots and other things  
16 of that sort they might have been included in the program.

17 What happened to those statements? What  
18 kind of considerations are given as you move ahead to  
19 allocate those funds and direct them toward low and moderate  
20 income areas?

21 A. I have already given direction, Alderman, to my  
22 staff that the contingent statements of approximately 270  
23 written statements of questions and comments which came out  
24 of a public hearing on May 12th were sent to my office prior

1 to the deadline on May 16th, to categorize them by  
2 department, will send them to the department together with a  
3 transcript of the public hearing, and will ask the  
4 department head to respond to me in writing as to the  
5 resolution of that.

6 I am not necessarily saying that they will  
7 be all positively resolved, but I will ask for a status  
8 report on that. In addition, as we are talking, it is  
9 probably a good idea to go back to the public hearings that  
10 took place at the end of January and February and do the  
11 same sort of thing. And based upon your suggestion, I will  
12 ask the staff to expand their efforts to include that as  
13 well.

14 Q. And I might even help your efforts by breaking  
15 out the category and presenting such a case.

16 A. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Stone.

18 ALDERMAN STONE: Thank you.

19 E X A M I N A T I O N

20 By Alderman Stone

21 Q. Mr. Schulz, this report card, page four. In 25  
22 words or less, tell me why the Street Sign Modernization  
23 Program will be using \$289,000.

24 A. The supplementary Street Sign Modernization,

1 the modernization program of Streets and Sanitation, those  
2 funds were used primarily to supplement corporate funds.

3 Q. It was used to supplement corporate funds?  
4 What is the \$58,000 for North Park Village, the sign  
5 locations?

6 A. Those are directional signs that point out  
7 different places to park for various senior citizens and  
8 other kinds of road signs out there.

9 Q. Two hundred eighty-nine thousand dollars were  
10 used citywide and \$55,000 specifically designated in the  
11 program is for one senior citizen site; is that correct?

12 A. The citywide sign allocation was an allocation  
13 made to supplement the substantial corporate budget of  
14 the --

15 Q. Hold it. The substantial corporate budget?  
16 Isn't it true that the corporate budget was cut in half with  
17 respect to the sign shop?

18 A. For the second half of 1980, Alderman, it has  
19 been maintained at the same level ever since.

20 Q. Which is 50 percent of what it was before 1980.

21 A. To my knowledge, that's true.

22 Q. Has anybody ever filed any complaint with you  
23 in your position with public works with respect to the  
24 status of unkept street signs of this city?

1           A.     Alderman, I appeared before the Finance  
2 Committee of the previous City Council in my job as Deputy  
3 Commissioner of Public Works.

4           Q.     Mr. Schulz, I am going to ask you to limit all  
5 of questions at this -- let's address the point. I asked  
6 you a question.

7                     Has anybody ever complained to you with  
8 respect to the street sign situation of this city, yes or  
9 no?

10          A.     Yes.

11          Q.     And it's obvious, therefore, that this present  
12 budget is insufficient, is it not, sir?

13          A.     I am not willing to make that judgment at this  
14 time.

15          Q.     How many sign shops will we have in the entire  
16 City of Chicago?

17          A.     One.

18          Q.     Where is it located?

19          A.     Thirty-fourth and Lawndale.

20          Q.     That sign shop services the entire City of  
21 Chicago?

22          A.     Yes. It does.

23          Q.     I think I have made my point with respect to  
24 that. I have a problem on page eight in response to

1 Alderman Burke's question regarding the lead poisoning  
2 enforcement. Where we cut \$452,000, you indicated that that  
3 could be absorbed by expecting the services at cost of  
4 \$250,000.

5 A. Yes, I did.

6 Q. Are we staying we have an insufficient use of  
7 funds in the past and that we can save almost one-half of  
8 the cost?

9 A. That's exactly what we are saying, Alderman.  
10 We have special purpose building inspectors that did nothing  
11 but check for lead paint problems. We believe that the rest  
12 of our building inspectors are properly trained to make the  
13 inspection of these problems under normal building  
14 inspections. And that's the basis upon which I gave my  
15 efficiency estimate.

16 Q. Your efficiency estimate is also based on the  
17 fact that the inspectors in the Department of Inspectional  
18 Services have more than sufficient time, with this proper  
19 training, to indulge in another section of their inspection;  
20 is that correct?

21 A. We believe that they will be able to accomplish  
22 this as part of their normal activities, Alderman.

23 Q. Did you ever include an efficiency report --  
24 and this is an unfair question to you because this was not

1 your field of reference prior to this, but I can only add my  
2 observations that it takes an awful long time to get a  
3 report presently on a normal building complaint, and I can  
4 only see this as adding to that particular situation.

5 Is it not true that lead paint and lead  
6 poisoning occur in specific sections of this city?

7 A. I believe that that's true, Alderman.

8 Q. In other words, it wouldn't be necessary, for  
9 instance, to give all of the inspectors training with  
10 respect to lead paint; isn't that true?

11 A. That would be true.

12 Q. So that this is the basis -- I would presume  
13 this is the basis of the presumption that the inspector  
14 could, in a limited area, be trained to observe and note  
15 places in which the paint with a lead base has been peeling  
16 and could possibly present a danger to people in that area;  
17 is that correct?

18 A. That's true. The primary emphasis is on the  
19 idea of including that as one of the routine functions  
20 carried out by the inspectors of those areas.

21 Q. Well, you see, my problem with that is those  
22 areas that are affected by lead paint poisoning are in areas  
23 of the City -- Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. Can I get some  
24 order?

1 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Council, please be in  
2 order.

3 ALDERMAN STONE: Q. They occur in the same  
4 areas of the City that people who have expressed great deals  
5 of concern have talked about. And that is, basically, in  
6 the older sections of this city and sections of this city  
7 which, unfortunately, are more probably -- the effect of  
8 unemployment is more possibly to occur.

9 I have seen children who have been  
10 affected by lead poisoning. It is devastating. And to cut  
11 a program while professing to be having an open pocket in  
12 this particular area really concerns me. I am not going to  
13 criticize this because I think there is a possibility that  
14 it can be done. But what I'm saying is that this is one  
15 area that certainly should be close to monitor.

16 A. Alderman, if I may respond very briefly in a  
17 cooperative spirit of dialogue. I think that the  
18 alternative and the course of action that we out to pursue  
19 is not that we have overlooked the inspectors. And we have  
20 a difficult time of dealing with the work load of Department  
21 of Inspectional Services. And I think that the course of  
22 action we want to pursue is not necessarily deliberation.  
23 It is to find out why they will exist and then total policy  
24 to sufficient resource to take sufficient adequate action.

1           Q.     I may respectfully suggest to the Budget  
2 Director that one of the areas that could address that  
3 problem is to join back the Departments of Building which is  
4 now part of the Department of Housing and the Department of  
5 Inspectional Services.

6                     I think there is some other areas that we  
7 should really study. What comes to mind, in particular, is  
8 the transfer of inspectors down in the Department of Health  
9 and the Department of Inspectional Services who are really  
10 dealing with health inspections. I think these are areas in  
11 which, not today but certainly along the line, is a process  
12 which should be studied.

13                    One last question with respect to a matter  
14 I broached yesterday, which was primarily with respect to  
15 business areas. And we had a discussion with respect to the  
16 fact that not only are areas that have already been blighted  
17 should be subject to approval but also areas which are in  
18 the process of deteriorating.

19                    Do you not feel that that would come under  
20 the definition of moderate, as we talked about low and  
21 moderate income, don't you believe that in areas where you  
22 have a deteriorating business district that would properly  
23 come under that classification?

24           A.     Yes, I do. And I have indicated that I would

1 support economic development activities such as business  
2 areas around the City.

3 Q. Thank you very much.

4 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Edmunds.

5 ALDERMAN EDMUNDS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

## E X A M I N A T I O N

By Alderman Edmunds

Q. Mr. Schulz, a question has arisen amongst my colleagues dealing with the necessity for continuing approval by the City Council for the expenditures of the fund that might flow from this particular application. I'd like you to take a few moments and give us your view as to what system you would like to see. Then, secondly, what problems you might have with any other system that's been suggested.

A. Alderman, I have already committed my office to provide to the Council quarterly reports in terms of the current program status. That is, how the funds are allocated by program category and also as to expenditures. That is to give the Council an updated status report on expenditures.

I have also included as much narrative information as I could in the area of the status as to individual physical development projects, economic activities and so forth, without moving away the members of the City Council. The first such report which I can honestly respond to the question from Alderman Humes is a report as of July 1, 1983, the history of the Community Development Block Grant Program from day one. And I would

1 be prepared to offer subsequent reports on the first of  
2 October, the first of January, and first of April during the  
3 program year.

4 In response to the question of the  
5 continuing approval of projects by members of the City  
6 Council, the administration has indicated that we would be  
7 prepared to live within ten percent of the cap on  
8 reprogramming in any particular project category. And for  
9 that, Alderman, I refer you to the supplementary information  
10 that was stuffed into the application booklets that were  
11 passed out last Tuesday. You will see in there an opening  
12 page.

13 Q. I don't have that.

14 A. Well, Alderman, within the two gray colored  
15 booklets that were handed out, there were inserted two  
16 statements. The first was Community Development Block Grant  
17 Program, Final Year IX Program Supplement, Projected Use of  
18 Funds by program category, and contained within it a  
19 detailed line by line listing of the program categories.

20 A similar supplement, Community  
21 Development Block Grant Jobs for Program Supplement,  
22 Projected Use of Funds by program category was stuffed into  
23 the other book.

24 As budget director and on behalf of the

1 administration, we have indicated that we would be prepared  
2 to live within the program categories that are outlined on  
3 that sheet, plus or minus ten percent. That is to say if we  
4 were to propose a reprogramming in any program category  
5 equal to or more than ten percent, we would concede the  
6 prior concurrence of the City Council before engaging in  
7 supplementary reprogramming.

8           The final plans of reprogramming is in  
9 response to routine sources of administrative problems, low  
10 bids, high bids, that sort of thing, or to respond to minor  
11 emergencies, we would be prepared to deal with on a routine  
12 basis, as previous administrations have done. I would point  
13 out, Alderman, that funds were moved around by previous  
14 administrations in a wholesale manner until you spent what  
15 is currently estimated at approximately 35 percent of the  
16 program, as it was presented to this program last May,  
17 changed to date.

18           The third thing we are prepared to do is  
19 for those types of expenditure programs which are contained  
20 in this program that require either the design of specific  
21 physical improvements and, therefore, the award of  
22 subcontracts or the award of contracts to third party on  
23 services provided, we would be prepared and in certain  
24 housing grants and economic development finance programs the

1 administration will be prepared to identify specific funding  
2 of decision criteria and make those available to the Council  
3 for their consultation.

4 Q. Dealing with that last point, will you provide  
5 information to the Council, would that be subsequent to the  
6 decision or prior to a decision?

7 A. We would provide criteria to the Council that  
8 would be used by the executive branch of government to make  
9 the fundamental allocation decision.

10 Q. Well, I realize that. But I am trying to get  
11 some classification. You are saying that you would lay down  
12 that criteria and submit that to the Council to explain the  
13 basis upon which you took that action or would you do that  
14 prior to taking that action?

15 A. We are prepared to come in to give a set of  
16 criteria by program category before there is specific  
17 expenditure decisions. But once those criteria have been  
18 provided to the Council, we would go ahead and make the  
19 expenditure decision.

20 We also are willing to subscribe the  
21 administration to inform any aldermen of any grant  
22 activities, any project activities in his or her ward that  
23 are contemplated for funding under this program and to  
24 hopefully enter into a consultative process regarding the

1 funding of such activities.

2 Q. Now, with respect to the second part of my  
3 question, will you give us some indication of what  
4 difficulty you and your staff might have, if you were to  
5 have to return to the City Council to receive approval line  
6 by line and so forth?

7 A. The guidelines that we have outlined in terms  
8 of the ten percent, plus or minus new programming cap, those  
9 program category lines, in my mind, constitute a significant  
10 restriction in terms of the use of funds and will place some  
11 administrative burden on the Community Development Program  
12 in the City of Chicago. But in the new spirit of  
13 consultancy between the administration and the City Council,  
14 it's a cost that we're prepared to live with.

15 Q. Which spirit are you referring to?

16 Let me just ask you one last point on  
17 this. I realize the Chairman is anxious for us to get to  
18 point of discussion.

19 Would you have serious problems of going  
20 beyond the ten percent cap that you are referring to, in  
21 terms of the operation of your office?

22 A. Alderman, if you look at the individual program  
23 categories, you will find that some of them are as small as  
24 a few hundred thousand dollars. I think to have the ten

1 percent cap is going to place a significant although not a  
2 actual limitation on the operations of management of this  
3 program. I think a cap smaller than ten percent would have  
4 the effect of making it virtually unworkable because we  
5 would be coming into the Council almost continuously with  
6 minor matters related to, as I said, various bid amounts and  
7 so forth. I think the ten percent is a useful compromise.

8 Q. Thank you very much.

9 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you very much. Mr.  
10 Schulz, on behalf of the committee of aldermen, we thank you  
11 for your patience and candor in answering the questions.

12 ALDERMAN MADRYZK: Alderman.

13 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Roti.

14 ALDERMAN MADRYZK: I don't want to be  
15 repetitive. A lot of questions have been answered. I also  
16 want to congratulate Mr. Schulz. And I know that you will  
17 be loyal to the present administration as you were to the  
18 last administration.

19 My question is in regards to the Forestry  
20 Department, of which I am fairly knowledgeable. I think the  
21 cutback in that particular department came down to dollars.  
22 It is going to indeed jeopardize not only the community but  
23 the safety of the citizens of the City of Chicago.

24 I know that you are very cognizant and

1 aware of the Dutch Elm Disease. I think it's present in  
2 Milwaukee, as Chicago. The fact of the matter is that at  
3 the present time I believe we have in excess of 3,000 Dutch  
4 Elm trees that are quite dead, some of whom have already  
5 debarked. What happens to those trees? As we all know, the  
6 City of Chicago is known as the Windy City.

7 Both externally and internally within the  
8 confines of this hallowed hall, as I know there is quite a  
9 wind and turbulation from time to time, perhaps maybe a  
10 tornado within the next four years, I would suggest that at  
11 the present time the laborers of the Forestry Department  
12 make approximately \$8.15 an hour.

13 That is the lowest paid labor here in the  
14 City of Chicago and indeed the Department of Streets and  
15 Sanitation, a private industry like the Edison Company,  
16 perhaps that's one reason why the rates are so high, those  
17 same type of category is \$15 an hour.

18 I know your staff has done excessive  
19 research in this. But are you contemplating holding us to  
20 that figure or is it something to consider?

21 A. Alderman, Alderman Burke asked a question  
22 yesterday that was along the same lines. I was in  
23 discussion last night with Acting Commissioner of Streets  
24 and Sanitation Dickinson.

1 I would contemplate that the first  
2 reprogramming activity that I will bring before the Chicago  
3 City Council under the ten percent cap agreement would be a  
4 restoration of funds at some level, not yet determined, for  
5 forestry operations, other than the Community Development  
6 Block Grant Program.

7 Q. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you very much, Mr.  
9 Schulz. We appreciate your candor and patience in dealing  
10 with all the questions.

11 We will now proceed to the hearing of the  
12 public witnesses. May I make this observation?

13 The Chair has high hopes that this matter  
14 will be resolved today. And, therefore it is going to be  
15 necessary to keep a quorum of the committee here.

16 And I am going to ask the public witnesses  
17 to confine their remarks to one minute. The Congress of the  
18 United States functions on a one minute rule. There is no  
19 reason why we shouldn't function otherwise here,  
20 particularly since we have had very extensive public  
21 hearings on this proposal before us.

22 And so we are asking the public witnesses  
23 to merely point out if there are any substantive changes in  
24 the proposal as now before the City Council. And I hope the

1 witnesses will not be repetitive.

2           The witnesses will testify from this  
3 center podium. I will ask the first five witnesses to line  
4 up over there in order to preserve time.

5           Mr. David Truitt, Chairman of the  
6 Community Development Advisory Committee; Mr. Will Purcell  
7 from the 39th Ward; Mr. Douglas Gills of 33rd West Jackson  
8 Boulevard, Chicago Rehab Network.

9           Is Mr. Truitt here? Mr. Truitt?

10          A VOICE: I think he just walked around.

11          CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Is Mr. Purcell here? Mr.  
12 Purcell, just take your place.

13          Mr. Gills, Douglas Gills. Mr. Bruce  
14 Crosby; Mr. Douglas Cassel; Mr. Harold Lukas.

15          We will call the rest of you as we move  
16 along.

17          The first witness is Mr. Truitt. And the  
18 clerk will be asked to keep time.

19          ALDERMAN BLOOM: Mr. Chairman.

20          CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Yes, Mr. Bloom.

21          ALDERMAN BLOOM: Just a point of information:  
22 Mr. Truitt has an additional capacity with regard to the  
23 Community Development Program. I am wondering if you would  
24 make a exception for him to go beyond one minute, because he

1 has been the chairman of the Community Development Advisory  
2 Committee.

3 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Well, we will see how he  
4 does. David Truitt, chairman of the Community Development  
5 Advisory Committee.

6 D A V I D M. T R U I T T  
7 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
8 as a Whole as follows:

9 THE WITNESS: I am David M. Truitt, chairman of  
10 the Community Development Advisory Committee and I appear  
11 before you today to urge your approval of the City's Year IX  
12 CDBG and jobs bill, CDBG final statement of Community  
13 Development objectives and projected use of funds and also  
14 the final program supplement which provides for the  
15 projected use of funds by category and project.

16 The Community Development Advisory  
17 Committee is a public advisory board consisting of 30  
18 neighborhood organizational city leaders and 15 citywide  
19 civic leaders. This committee, over the last several years,  
20 has scrutinized the various aspects of the Community  
21 Development Block Grant Program, participated in the public  
22 hearings and has long sought to bring about a number of  
23 changes recently incorporated in the program. These final  
24 statements and final program supplements incorporate changes

1 which were made to the proposed statements and program  
2 supplements and were made in consultation with and, in many  
3 instances, upon the firm recommendation of the Community  
4 Development Advisory Committee.

5           The principal thrust of many of the  
6 changes to reduce or eliminate funding to City departments  
7 or programs which are not a part of community development  
8 and can be more appropriately funded through the City's own  
9 budget.

10           These funds will now be used for high  
11 priority neighborhood needs throughout Chicago, attempting  
12 wherever possible to provide for leveraged funds which  
13 directly rebuild the community, create useful jobs in  
14 concert with new or existing other community development  
15 programs so that the positive impact on the community is at  
16 a maximum.

17           The changes also, in some instances, move  
18 funds from programs which by their nature cannot get under  
19 way during this year to programs which can be commenced  
20 immediately. A numbers of programs which funds are now  
21 being directed involve the funding of community based  
22 not-for-profit organizations rather than City departments.  
23 This allows for more community involvement, community  
24 control and also results in substantial savings in the cost

1 of program implementation. The services by the delegate  
2 agencies are often enhanced by volunteer involvement.

3 Many of these changes also redirect funds  
4 from low priority programs, such as sign modernization, to  
5 high priority programs where there has been a demonstrated  
6 need expressed by the community. For these reasons, the  
7 Community Development Advisory Committee, in accord with  
8 their responsibility to advise the City on the allocation  
9 and usage of Community Development Funds, welcomes this  
10 opportunity to speak to you and urges your adoption and  
11 approval of these two Block Grant statements.

12 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Truitt.

13 ALDERMAN HUMES: Do you have copies of the  
14 statement for us?

15 THE WITNESS: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Questions? Mr. Harris.

17 MR. HARRIS: Sir, is it possible to receive  
18 minutes of your meetings?

19 THE WITNESS: It certainly is.

20 MR. HARRIS: Can we send a notice to all the  
21 aldermen?

22 THE WITNESS: Certainly. Our meetings are open  
23 to the public to listen and we will be glad to have you.

24 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Truitt. Any

1 more questions for Mr. Truitt?

2 ALDERMAN ORR: I have just one question.

3 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Mr. Orr.

4 ALDERMAN ORR: I know in the past we at the  
5 Community Development Advisory Committee have had a number  
6 of conflicts with the coordinating committee. I'd just like  
7 for you to tell the aldermen the reason for this  
8 relationship so far with the acting budget director and the  
9 other officers.

10 THE WITNESS: Well, it's a major difference.  
11 Things have been improving over the years. But I will say  
12 this time a substantial difference was that before the  
13 program changes were made, we were invited in, given advance  
14 notice of our hole board can meet. And then the executive  
15 committee was invited in to meet with the chairman and the  
16 staff, so we can be in a church league session, actually  
17 working.

18 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Rush.

19 ALDERMAN RUSH: Mr. Truitt, will you please  
20 provide the Council with list of the individuals who  
21 comprise your advisory board?

22 THE WITNESS: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Truitt.

24 (Witness excused.)

1 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Mr. Will Purcell.

2 W I L L I E P U R C E L L

3 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
4 as a Whole as follows:

5 THE WITNESS: Thank you for this opportunity to  
6 come before the Council. I speak about this matter as far  
7 as Community Block Grant Funds are concerned. On my  
8 submission, the following lines of the Grant Funds is that  
9 they are to address the needs of the community at large,  
10 putting importance on crucial issues that come up, that may  
11 occur, that we have to deal with right away, and then the  
12 long range issues that you have to deal with as a whole.

13 And the large rhetoric of where these  
14 funds are going to be allocated I really, like, must have  
15 information about where these funds are going as far as  
16 small businesses are concerned. As you know, 50 percent of  
17 all businesses in America fail and it's mainly because lack  
18 of finance and lack of management and lack of help from  
19 people such as yourself.

20 So what I feel I should address more  
21 freely and more purely is where is this money going in  
22 response to the businesses in the communities? Because the  
23 businesses in the communities are the backbone of the  
24 communities and when they are able to sustain themselves,

1 then they are able to help the communities also. So I feel  
2 this is a pressing need that needs to be addressed. And I  
3 don't get the feedback that I think is necessary. Thank you

4 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you very much, Mr.  
5 Purcell.

6 (Witness excused.)

7 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Mr. Don Gills, Chicago  
8 Rehab Network.

9 D O N G I L L S

10 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
11 as a Whole as follows:

12 THE WITNESS: Members of the Council, ladies  
13 and gentlemen: Over the past several years the Chicago  
14 Rehab Network has been intimately involved in struggling  
15 with the City administration and using every opportunity in  
16 the Council to urge a democratization of the policy making  
17 process that was used in the allocation of the determination  
18 of use of City funds.

19 We have been concerned about three  
20 questions. Essentially, one was how do you get more people  
21 involved in making decisions when it seems that we have a  
22 decision in the City Council where the Council has decided  
23 for once they will stand up. I think that the issues decide  
24 which side the Council stands.

1                   Now, efficiency in administration has been  
2 opposed in the packages submitted to the Council for its  
3 consideration and action, begins to do what we want it want  
4 it to do in terms of targeting more funds for direct use in  
5 the target impact areas, be they along neighborhood lines,  
6 along class lines, along racial or nationality lines, and  
7 even including the question of the historical sex based  
8 inequities of the natural -- of the use of the funds.

9                   So we are concerned about the question of  
10 equitable redistribution of these scarce resources, based on  
11 the notion that we should try to put more resources in the  
12 hands of the people who need them most. It seems that the  
13 present proposal begins to move us in that direction.

14                  And while we're sympathetic to the  
15 Council's need to review and to determine policy and set a  
16 policy course based on input from public hearing, from  
17 extensive community debate, we would also caution Council  
18 against proposals that would impede the second objective,  
19 which is to be efficient in the administration of these  
20 funds, by cautioning against the proposal that would mean  
21 the Council would be creating a position by replacing the  
22 administrative arm of government. And therefore, we would  
23 need a Department of Housing to serve as a staff, to  
24 evaluate any community organization proposals for Council to

1 follow this notion, or to provide too close scrutiny on  
2 details that amount to administrative reprogramming  
3 questions.

4 I'd like to also caution the Council  
5 again. Last year at this time we came before Council and we  
6 talked about the fact that some of the CD funds were being  
7 reprogrammed outside of the area of intent. During the  
8 summer of this past year we came to Council and we irged  
9 Council to pay close attention, to exercise more scrutiny in  
10 terms of looking at CD proposals and making sure that they  
11 were consistent with the guidelines and that the executive  
12 branch would adhere to the intent of the CD proposals.

13 And it seems that --

14 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Mr. Gills, I'm sorry, but  
15 your time is up, sir.

16 THE WITNESS: Let me just finish by saying  
17 this. That we think that the present proposal moves us  
18 closer towards power to the people. We do believe that  
19 there needs to be a creative dialogue in the Council between  
20 the branch of the Council and the City and its population to  
21 make sure that there is an equitable distribution of those  
22 resources. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank very much, Mr. Gills.

24 (Witness excused.)

1 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Mr. Crosby, Bruce Crosby.  
2 Is Mr. Crosby here?

3 The next witnesses will be Mr. Douglas  
4 Cassel, Harold Lukas, John Benish and Oscar Worrill, and  
5 Bruce Crosby.

6 B R U C E C R O S B Y  
7 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
8 as a Whole as follows:

9 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and  
10 members of the City Council. My name is Bruce Crosby. I  
11 live at 8230 South Bishop. I am acting chairman of the  
12 South Ward Association of Neighborhoods. And I will be  
13 brief.

14 In Year VIII the City of Chicago allocated  
15 \$1,209,000 in funding for the construction of a fieldhouse  
16 in (Inaudible) Park. This money was to be given to the  
17 Chicago Park District. SWAN has been trying for sometime to  
18 get citizen input into this project. The cost of the  
19 proposed facility does not meet the recreational and the  
20 other needs of people who will use it.

21 Along with ignoring our efforts to have broader  
22 citizen participation in this project, the Chicago Park  
23 District refuses to get a commitment from Blacking  
24 Construction Company of Dolton, Illinois, the firm awarded

1 this contract, to show a commitment to involve minority  
2 subcontractors in the construction of this project.

3           The (Inaudible) Park Fieldhouse has been a  
4 burning issue in our community since 1971. SWAN believes  
5 that Blacking Construction's lack of commitment to the  
6 minority subcontractors violates Section 3 of the Housing  
7 and Development Act of 1968, amended 1969, Community  
8 Development Housing Acts of 1974, which provides, and I  
9 quote, that "to raise, where it's feasible, training and  
10 employment opportunities shall be made available to lower  
11 income residents of project areas and that contracts be  
12 awarded to small business located within the projects area  
13 for only substantial part by project area residents."

14           Section 3 coverage applies to programs  
15 providing direct financial assistance of housing, urban  
16 planning, development, redevelopment or renewal for  
17 community serving, community development and new development  
18 of block grants, under the Housing and Development Act. And  
19 now, in the midst of the recent consent decree, the budget  
20 director proposes \$1.3 million in CDBG funds for to  
21 rehabilitate 23 athletic fields. He claimed that this fund  
22 will be used in addition for the UPARR money for the  
23 rehabilitation of 120 playgrounds and 105 parks, 23 athletic  
24 fields and 9 City-owned playgrounds. All of this work must

1 be completed by 9/3/84.

2 We respectfully request that a committee  
3 of the City Council monitor the spending of these monies and  
4 the Park District complies with the consent decree of the  
5 Housing Community Development Act take place. In addition,  
6 just as we request at the public hearing, we request your  
7 assistance in helping us find additional monies needed to  
8 build the type of fieldhouse in (Inaudible) Park which  
9 responds to the recreational and other needs of the  
10 (Inaudible) Park community.

11 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you very much, Mr.  
12 Crosby.

13 (Witness excused.)

14 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Mr. Douglas Cassel. The  
15 next one will be Mr. Lukas.

16 D O U G L A S C A S S E L  
17 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
18 as a Whole as follows:

19 THE WITNESS: Mr. Chairman Pucinski, members of  
20 the City Council. Thank you very much for this opportunity  
21 of public comment by ourselves and others as citizens of  
22 Chicago. I must say that it is a pleasure to see not 29  
23 aldermen, not 21 aldermen, but all 50 aldermen putting aside  
24 their differences for a while and moving ahead with

1 important business of the City. Thank you very much for  
2 that, Aldermen.

3 I am here as co-director of the Chicago  
4 Energy Commission, a group of distinguished and diverse  
5 Chicagoans who issued a report in January which has been  
6 endorsed by both the major newspapers, whose recommendations  
7 were endorsed by the Mayor, calling for a major energy  
8 conservation program to save Chicagoans billions of dollars  
9 a year on their gas and electric bills and to create 20 to  
10 30,000 jobs in the next ten years.

11 It really was a delight to hear the  
12 questions from Alderman Bloom and Alderman Burke, and  
13 especially the answers of Budget Director Mr. Schulz,  
14 regarding a significant portion of the housing money in the  
15 CD budget will be available for energy conservation  
16 undertaken.

17 The only additional concern would be with  
18 respect to the CD budget that I would like to express, to  
19 bring to the attention of all of you is that wherever any  
20 negotiations are going on, not only in this room but in the  
21 rooms behind and around us, to place whatever constraints  
22 are being considered on the expenditure of CD money that no  
23 constraints be imposed that would limit the possibility of  
24 spending significant sums of that housing money for energy

1 conservation improvements overall. Thank you very much.

2 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you very much.

3 (Witness excused.)

4 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: I want to congratulate our  
5 witnesses for cooperating. They have all stayed within  
6 close to one minute, and I think we will get through this  
7 whole list with that kind of cooperation.

8 Mr. Robert Lukas, Kenwood/Oakland  
9 Community Organization.

10 R O B E R T L U K A S

11 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
12 as a Whole as follows:

13 THE WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And  
14 good afternoon to the Council and the members of the public.

15 I suggest that the aldermen that's  
16 caucusing listen to me now or you are going to have to  
17 listen later. I said I would respectfully suggest that the  
18 aldermen who is now caucusing listen to the citizens today  
19 or you will most certainly listen later.

20 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Order.

21 THE WITNESS: Now, I happen to be executive  
22 director of the Kenwood/Oakland Community Organization. I  
23 also happen to be the president of the Chicago Housing  
24 Network, a 29 member group, multiracial groups, black, white

1 and Hispanic. And I am also on the Mayor's Community  
2 Advisory Committee and have been on the Mayor's Community  
3 Advisory Committee for three years. And I am also on the  
4 Mayor's Housing Subcommittee. And that's why I know a great  
5 deal about this program. And that's why I learned  
6 yesterday, to my amazement, I shouldn't have been amazed,  
7 that most of the aldermen are asking all these asinine  
8 questions knew nothing about the program.

9           To start with, the whole reason why there  
10 is a Community Development Block Grant Program that was  
11 started in 1974 was because of the interest in the  
12 neighborhood groups across this country. And when that Act  
13 was passed in 1974, if you care to read it, if you care to  
14 read it, you may see in the preamble that the money is  
15 intended for primarily for moderate to low income  
16 communities.

17           You need to read the Act. You need to  
18 read the Act in order to understand it. And you are  
19 obviously not familiar with the process. That's because you  
20 have been sitting down here for years passing on the program  
21 without asking any questions. If you are familiar with the  
22 process, there were a number of public hearings, four, five  
23 and six, that's held around this city, and some of them in  
24 your wards.

1 And it was at that time you should have  
2 come to the public hearings and asked some of these  
3 questions.

4 Beyond that, there is a committee called  
5 the coordinating committee, that was first brought into  
6 being by Mayor Daley and was perpetuated by Byrne and  
7 Bilandic. And the coordinating committee really was only,  
8 according to the legislation, the group that's posted to  
9 elect the policy for the program, not the City Council.

10 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Your time is up.

11 THE WITNESS: I understand. Now there is also  
12 the Community Development Advisory Committee, which we have  
13 been advising Mayor Byrne and Mayor Bilandic. Had Mayor  
14 Byrne listened to us, she wouldn't have messed up all that  
15 money.

16 And, again, any ward these Aldermen that  
17 complain about there is nothing in their ward don't  
18 understand the process. Because you should have submitted  
19 preliminary applications last February like everybody else.  
20 You don't deserve it. And you are not above the law.

21 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Mr. Lukas, your time is up.

22 THE WITNESS: I know. Plus the fact, you said  
23 that you want somebody from every project in every program.  
24 What are you going to do, replace the staff?

1 I submit to you it's administratively  
2 impossible. But then you are going to replace the staff, if  
3 you are going to nitpicking on some of the programs and  
4 every project.

5 Now, lastly, before I sit down, what you  
6 probably suggest is illegal. But since you are going to  
7 court anyway, messing up the people's money, wasting  
8 people's money in court, you probably don't mind it. What  
9 you probably suggest is illegal according to the  
10 regulations.

11 Plus the fact that the Mayor is supposed  
12 to sign the certification. And that certification indicates  
13 that he is going to comply with civil rights, Title VI,  
14 affirmative action and all that business. Now, he is  
15 responsible for that. There is no way for the HUD or the  
16 Congress to hold 50 people responsible for the  
17 administration of a program.

18 And lastly, before I sit down, some of you  
19 have been down here --

20 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Ma'am --

21 THE WITNESS: It's my chance, man. Some of you  
22 have been sitting here for years. You have wasted the  
23 public's money for years. One million dollar suits, you have  
24 wasted and stole the public's money. Now you are nitpicking

1 about some lousy hundred million dollars.

2 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Lukas.

3 THE WITNESS: And now you are messing with the  
4 program.

5 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Lukas. The  
6 Chair appreciates the approval of the audience.

7 (Witness excused.)

8 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Brother John Prentiss,  
9 Northwest Community Organization. I might observe that we  
10 realize nothing more from these outbursts. So proceed,  
11 Brother Prentiss.

12 R O Y H A N S O N

13 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
14 as a Whole as follows:

15 THE WITNESS: Well, gentlemen, now that the  
16 circus is over, my name is Roy Hanson. And I am speaking in  
17 the place of Brother John Prentiss. He couldn't make it  
18 himself.

19 Now, I am a member of the Northwestern  
20 Community Organization, a community organization in West  
21 Town.

22 We're very concerned that the City do  
23 something about the vaulted sidewalks and it's a problem in  
24 our community. These sidewalks are dangerous and hazardous.

1 Believe me, I know.

2 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Brother, would you sustain  
3 for a minute? Ladies and gentlemen, we have a lot of  
4 witnesses. We all have been waiting patiently. I hope you  
5 will help us give them the respect they deserve. So I will  
6 ask the galleries to please remain quiet.

7 Proceed.

8 THE WITNESS: I know. I stepped in a couple of  
9 these collapsed sidewalks and fell right up to my crotch.  
10 And some fellow helped me and said why don't you sue the  
11 City? Thank God, I only got a few scratches. And I know  
12 how to fall. And I don't drink.

13 In the last few years the City has handled  
14 these collapsing sidewalks with a program of temporary  
15 repairs, with a program that these repairs never lasted more  
16 than a few months. They just put some gravel in it and it  
17 wears away.

18 Now, instead of -- Now, this temporary  
19 help, fixing up, patching, all it does is waste the City's  
20 money, instead of fixing something that's permanent.

21 Now then, we ask that the Council have  
22 this money in the budget that is allocated for the vaulted  
23 sidewalks repair, untouched, and this money be spent for  
24 permanent repairs. Thank you very much.

(Witness excused.)

CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Mr. Harold L. Lucos.

H A R O L D L U C O S

called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee as a Whole as follows:

THE WITNESS: Good afternoon. I revised my statement from the public hearings about the Chicago Community Block Grant Program held on May 12th. I will get directly to the point.

It amazes me that the Vrdolyak 29 block would be concerned about specifics on geographic disagreement on CDBG funds under Mayor Washington's administration. That probably did not occur under Mayors Daley, Bilandic and Byrne.

Nevertheless, a pattern of racial discrimination has existed within the federally funded CDGB Program which has set over the eight years of the Block Grant Program. Federal funds have been dispersed throughout Chicago's neighborhoods at the discretion of the Mayor.

The U.S. Justice Department just settled a \$6 million suit against the Chicago Park District for racial discretion in black and Hispanic parks. The consent decree says that in minority areas the parks receive less staffing, have fewer facilities than parks in the white areas. A part

1 of the Park District employment record for 1982 shows that  
2 of the 74 highest paid employees all making more than  
3 \$36,000, 68 were white, one was black and one was Hispanic,  
4 four were not identified by race.

5 Further investigation by the Chicago  
6 Reporter of metropolitan Chicago reveals the same pattern of  
7 racial discrimination in five places of Chicago municipal  
8 services, including the Police Department, the Fire  
9 Department, the Public Libraries and the Chicago Transit  
10 Authority. All of these municipal service agencies receive  
11 CDEG funds.

12 Grant plans for 1982 were upheld and made  
13 a part of the area of enterprise zones designations, all  
14 significant of the vast urban revitalization that will  
15 transform the Douglas community into high technology  
16 computer age, 21st century urban neighborhood over the next  
17 ten years.

18 The 1992 Corporation IFP, Michael Reese  
19 Hospital, McCormick Place, South Side Planning Board, and  
20 other major corporations have plans on the drawing board for  
21 these communities. These community development plans have  
22 little, if any, neighborhood input from indigenous  
23 cooperation from the Douglas community. Hopefully, Harold  
24 Washington can be persuaded to use his influence and

1 discretion, as Mayor, to cause the directive in capital into  
2 the Douglas community to expand employment opportunities for  
3 our low and moderate income residents.

4           There are several historically significant  
5 buildings within the community which could be preserved and  
6 restored to help improve the quality of life for area  
7 residents, due to the development of cultural, educational  
8 and leisure time activities.

9           I must commend the Washington  
10 administration for its foresight and wisdom in shifting of  
11 \$13.5 million CDBG Year IX funds earmarked for several City  
12 jobs to neighborhood redevelopment and rehabilitation.  
13 Undoubtedly, this proposed action will help stimulate  
14 neighborhood economy.

15           Simultaneously, I must also plead for  
16 additional CDBG funds for public/private joint development  
17 programs. The \$200,000 allocation to start up ventures a  
18 progress in innovative initiative to implement public and  
19 private property, in areas of public service provisions,  
20 building rehabilitation and economic development. There is  
21 not enough capital to develop the latter program of Chicago  
22 areas neighborhoods.

23           Lastly, my testimony is today is to  
24 clarify the call for parity of the Chicago Community

1 Development Block Grant Program. I call for the Washington  
2 administration to halt this matter of racial discrimination  
3 in the CDBG program.

4 I challenge the Vrdolyak 29 block to give  
5 up there obstructionist tactics and allow Mayor Washington  
6 the flexibility and freedom to institute a CDBG program  
7 based upon the needs of all Chicago's neighborhoods. I  
8 thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Lucos.

10 (Witness excused.)

11 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Mr. Oscar Worrill. The  
12 next witness will be Cleophus M. Cavin, Transit Safety  
13 Workers, and the next witness will be Elinor Elam. Please  
14 step forward, we can save some time.

15 Proceed, Mr. Worrill.

16 O S C A R W O R R I L L

17 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
18 as a Whole as follows:

19 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon, members of the  
20 City Council. My name is Oscar Worrill, assistant chairman  
21 of the Task Force of Black Political Empowerment. My  
22 statement is regarding the Community Development Block Grant  
23 Fund. The membership of the Task Force of Black Political  
24 Empowerment fully supports the Mayor's efforts to

1 redistribute Community Block Grant Funds for communities  
2 throughout the City of Chicago on the basis of need as  
3 opposed to greed.

4           Thus, we fully agree with the following  
5 points proposed by Mayor Washington: Number one, the  
6 shifting of \$13.5 million from administration operations to  
7 the improvement of neighborhoods; number two, an increase in  
8 funding for senior citizens programs, child care and health;  
9 number three, an increase of \$9.5 million toward housing  
10 finance programs, including a \$6.5 million increase for low  
11 interest rehabilitation loans for multi-unit buildings,  
12 additional \$2 million for the rehabilitation of moderate  
13 income other occupied homes; number four, increased funding  
14 for the improvement of neighborhood businesses, industrial  
15 streets and viaduct improvements; number five, an increase  
16 in funding for the improvement in repair of sidewalks,  
17 curbs, gutters and streets; number six, at least \$1 million  
18 for programs targeted for black woman.

19           The Task Force of Black Political  
20 Empowerment is the coalition representing some 25 community  
21 groups throughout the 19 predominantly black wards of this  
22 city. We are a community based organization that is  
23 dedicated to the proposition of equity, parity and unity for  
24 all of the people of Chicago.

1 We believe that the only way to achieve  
2 equity, parity and unity is through the restoration and  
3 rehabilitation of communities in the 19 predominantly black  
4 wards of the City and the full participation of black  
5 citizens in every level of government in this city.

6 Most administrations in this city have  
7 been denied this participation of black citizens. However,  
8 the present administration has dedicated itself to an open  
9 process and we applaud that openness. We call on you as the  
10 representatives of this city and this legislative body to  
11 cooperate with our mayor and community groups in advancing  
12 the cause of equity, parity and unity in Chicago, through a  
13 sound and fair distribution of Community Development Block  
14 Grant funds. Thank you for your time.

15 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Worrill.

16 (Witness excused.)

17 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Our next witness is  
18 Cleophis Cavin, a safety aide of the Chicago Transit  
19 Authority. Our next witness will be Elinor Elam.

20 C L E O P H I S C A V I N  
21 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
22 as a Whole as follows:

23 THE WITNESS: Ladies and gentlemen, my name is  
24 Cleophis Cavin. I am a Transit Security Aide.

1                   In 1978 the federal government had  
2 undertaken an endeavor to secure safe riding on mass transit  
3 systems nationwide in view of escalating crime. Funds were  
4 allocated by the government to major cities to combat the  
5 problem. By August 1978, the city of Chicago coined the  
6 Transit Safety Aide program, a unit that would act as an  
7 integral branch of the Chicago Police Department, subjugated  
8 to departmental rules and regulations.

9                   Transit Aide's were assigned to serve as  
10 physical and psychological deterrents to crime; to act as  
11 eyes and ears of the department. Initially the program ws  
12 funded for three years. It has reaffirmed its effectiveness  
13 in counteracting crime and other incidents before they  
14 occur. August 1983 will mark five years of addressing  
15 excellent public service.

16                  Transit Aides work directly with police,  
17 they carry police radios which prompt immediate contact to  
18 emergency medical, fires, police and other departments. We  
19 ride CTA rail systems giving countless directions and  
20 assisting the public in many ways. We maintain stationary  
21 El assignments at trouble spots during school hours and rush  
22 hours, both mornings and evenings.

23                  Since our conception Transit Aides have  
24 exceeded above and beyond the call of duty. This attention

1 to duty has applied to off duty as well with equal results.

2 We receive preliminary training at the  
3 Chicago Police Training Academy in general police  
4 procedures, criminal law, and CPR, as well as the Heimlick  
5 maneuver, all with good results.

6 Transit Aides do not have the power of  
7 arrest. However, the applicability of this unit should not  
8 be undermined. We have potentials that are, as yet,  
9 untapped. For example, in Los Angeles they have a civilian  
10 force similar to Transit Aides, except that these take over  
11 duties that usually prohibit police officers from being  
12 effective.

13 They also conduct some of the preliminary  
14 investigations, thereby freeing officers to deal more with  
15 real crime, not paperwork. The civilians handle a bulk of  
16 paperwork and other menial procedures that abuse police  
17 manpower. This could be done in Chicago.

18 Transit Aides are not confined to rail  
19 systems and subways. We could be instrumental on city buses  
20 as well. The potential would be endless in neighborhood  
21 crime awareness programs.

22 Transit Aides have been instrumental  
23 during special city events as well, such as the ChicagoFest  
24 St. Patrick's Day Parade, the Pope's visit, and a host of

1 other events. We direct congested loop area traffic during  
2 CTA strikes. We work the El stations adjacent Cubs and Sox  
3 Parks during summer sessions, assisting in crowd control.  
4 Working crowd control during the blizzard of 1979 was a  
5 monumental effort on the part of Transit Aides. Although  
6 daily altercations took place, no one has ever been  
7 sseriously injured.

8               This program is a first in uniqueness, the  
9 first one in Chicago history that combats crime unarmed, but  
10 effective. At first beginning, admittedly most felt like  
11 guinea pigs, walking targets. After four and a half years  
12 of practical experimental knowledge of on the job training,  
13 we are still making our presence felt. Not to mention the  
14 countless dollars both the city and the CTA has saved simply  
15 by our presence. The public feels some assurance of safety  
16 when they see us.

17               We urge the city to take a closer and  
18 better look at the program and its potential. We would like  
19 to continue to serve the City of Chicago and its citizens,  
20 to make the CTA a safer transit system for the City of  
21 Chicago. We urge you to assist us in achieving this goal.

22               CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you very much.

23                       (Witness excused.)

24               CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: The next witness is Elinor

1 Elam from the League of Women Voters. The next witness will  
2 be Tony Scipione, Chicago Fire Department.

3 E L I N O R E L A M

4 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
5 as a Whole as follows:

6 THE WITNESS: My name is Elinor Elam. I am  
7 president of the Chicago League of Women Voters.

8 The League has been monitoring the  
9 Community Development Block Grant Program since its  
10 inception in 1974. One of our prime areas of concern over  
11 the years has been the need for improvement and informed  
12 citizen participation. Over the eight years of the program  
13 and especially since the requirements for citizen participation  
14 we are strengthened in the 1978 regulations, the role of  
15 community based and civic organizations has increased.

16 For establishment of Community Development  
17 Advisory Committee in 1979, information became more readily  
18 available, a major requirement for informed citizens to  
19 participate. There has been a constant and increasing  
20 effort by community based organizations, coalitions,  
21 citywide groups to be informed about the many community  
22 development activities and programs and to assist in the  
23 implementation of these programs and also to monitor  
24 community development activities.

1                   However, until the last year or two the  
2 City Council, with few exceptions, has given little interest  
3 and few questions, approved CD applications each year. And  
4 suddenly we have this great surge of interest as we move  
5 toward the ninth year of the Community Development Block  
6 Grant Program.

7                   We would suggest that the Council review  
8 the federal regulation as it relates to the use of CD funds.  
9 You should also become aware of the certifications that must  
10 be signed by the Mayor as an additional official  
11 representative of the grantee as designated by HUD, as I  
12 understand the intent and some members of the Council.

13                   The approval process suggests that it  
14 could certainly impede the implementation of a community  
15 development program and scuttle any attempts at orderly  
16 planning. The city has been criticized for years for not  
17 targeting community development funds. And since many  
18 cities use this scatter shot approach, the neighborhood  
19 strategy areas were added as a requirement.

20                   Now, it seems to me you are aiming for the  
21 broad brush, although the regulations are less rigid. They  
22 still require compliance with primary objectives of the Act  
23 that the fund be used principally for the benefit of low and  
24 moderate income people, for eliminating slums and blight and

1 for an urgent need and that we have this urgent need must be  
2 designated by the Mayor.

3 HUD is also concerned about timely draw  
4 out on for funds that is using each year's allocations  
5 during that program year. The City has improved its timely  
6 draw on last year's by better planning and selection of  
7 projects. Detailed review and approval by the Council could  
8 only impede and slow down this process.

9 We suggest that this Council approve the  
10 Year IX application as submitted to you without any  
11 restrictive provisions.

12 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Any questions? Mr. Grove.

13 MR. GROVE: Miss Elam, also a question for  
14 you. Your point that the funds can only be used during that  
15 program year, is that contained in the federal regulation?

16 THE WITNESS: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you very much.

18 (Witness excused.)

19 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Tony Scipione. The next  
20 witness will be Malcolm Hicks.

21 A N T H O N Y S C I P I O N E, J R.  
22 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
23 as a Whole as follows:

24 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman,

1 members of the City Council, ladies and gentlemen. My name  
2 is Tony Scipione. I am currently employed by the Chicago  
3 City Fire Department.

4 The Chicago Fire Department is proposing  
5 the program of first response to be implemented in the  
6 Chicago Housing Authority according to the Chicago Fire  
7 Department provisions and public services and instruct  
8 residents in the community who have had prior first aid  
9 training.

10 First response, of course, is approved by  
11 the Illinois Department of Transportation and the resource  
12 hospitals. This, of course, will certify these residents in  
13 first aid and cardiac pulmonary resuscitation.

14 The program will work as follows: A  
15 resident will call 911 for emergency service; the Chicago  
16 Fire Department dispatchers would send an ambulance unit and  
17 also notify personnel in the first aid station, both would  
18 respond to the scene of the incident. These trained first  
19 responders will assist with medical care under the  
20 supervision of the Chicago Fire Department paramedics.

21 In cases of serious trauma they would  
22 assist until the arrival of a field officer and/or a second  
23 ambulance. They would also assist in the removals and crowd  
24 control. In instances where an ambulance is not available

1 in the immediate area, these civilian first responders would  
2 respond to the incident and administer immediate first aid  
3 care until the arrival of an ambulance.

4 In incidents where a civilian should walk  
5 into the first aid station for medical assistance, the first  
6 respondents would treat the victim and inform the ambulance  
7 dispatch center of severity or the nature of the illness.  
8 At no time will first respondent take the medical  
9 responsibility for a patient.

10 The ambulance dispatch center will  
11 determine if the incident necessitates an ambulance. In  
12 that sense, the program will increase understanding,  
13 utilization and the efficiency of the emergency medical  
14 services of Chicago Housing Authority housing complexes.  
15 This program will also decrease the number of false alarms  
16 and secure the event of ambulance availability in life  
17 threatening situations.

18 In 1982 this service cost the City of  
19 Chicago approximately \$522 million approximately. Of all  
20 the calls that the Chicago Fire Department emergency medical  
21 service responded to, 40 percent of those were no service.  
22 The cost of the success of this program would expand  
23 opportunities for the residents in the community.  
24 Hopefully, the young adults involved in this program will

1 continue with their education in the medical field, which  
2 have opportunities available.

3 To operate this program effectively for  
4 one year the total amount we are requesting is \$100,000.  
5 This would pay salaries for the first respondent personnel  
6 and also provide for necessary training and equipment.  
7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Are there any questions?

9 A VOICE: They don't have any questions. They  
10 haven't listened to him.

11 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you, Mr. Scipione.

12 (Witness excused.)

13 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: The next witness is  
14 Malcolm Hicks of the Association of Medical Professionals.  
15 The next witness after that will be Larry Thompson.

16 M A L C O L M H I C K S

17 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
18 as a Whole as follows:

19 THE WITNESS: Good afternoon, gentlemen. I  
20 want to thank you, members of the Council and distinguished  
21 citizenry, for this opportunity.

22 I am not going to claim the knowledge of  
23 the comprehensive sections of the Acts and all the  
24 implications of the grant, but I do have something to say

1 about housing. I do happen to have been the person who,  
2 over the previous administrations, was authorized -- the  
3 only person authorized to okay money on the 312 and 150  
4 program. So I know something about what has been done and  
5 how it was done.

6           This money was supposedly allocated to low  
7 and moderate income people. As a citizen of Chicago, I am  
8 interested in getting some of it, but a great deal of it  
9 went to other incomes. I made the appraisal and signed the  
10 authorization and know that the end result was not much of  
11 it was given in many areas where it was needed the most.

12           We don't want to be hostile to any members  
13 of the Council, but we do feel that there was a thought one  
14 time ago that every citizen had a right to decent housing in  
15 a community environment. That was a promise, I think, of  
16 the original Housing Act.

17           Many of us here seem to think that this is  
18 a game of fun. But there is a tremendous amount of  
19 hostility all over that reflects the fact that historically  
20 this money has been misallocated, if not stolen. And we  
21 hope that in the future as we all realize we have all got to  
22 live here together that, contrary to the discussions going  
23 on in and around the City, there is a new majority and we  
24 only expect parity.

1 We will not lie down in any defeats, that  
2 we are waiting point for point. We just want parity and we  
3 intend to get it. We hope that you will pass this Act as  
4 judiciously as possible and see that the work to be done is  
5 done. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Any questions? Alderman  
7 O'Connor.

8 ALDERMAN O'CONNOR: Excuse me. Did you say  
9 that you were in charge fund?

10 THE WITNESS: Yes. At the outset of this  
11 program there had to be a federal representative who  
12 allocated the money.

13 ALDERMAN O'CONNOR: Was this allocated? You  
14 say it was listed --

15 THE WITNESS: I say in the sense that a greater  
16 amount of money went to Lincoln Park, which I have no  
17 objection to, but almost all of the approvals I did and the  
18 authorizations that were made were based on communities that  
19 had more city parks relative to Woodlawn and some areas like  
20 Chatham, for instance, is not on the program.

21 There was no money allocated to Woodlawn,  
22 South Shore, Douglas Park, North Austin, Garfield. And  
23 these areas were in the program. There were some areas in  
24 the City you might have expected. Some people think that

1 Chatham is a low-moderate income area based on the fact that  
2 it's black, but they were not in the neighborhood, but South  
3 Shore and Hyde Park and some others.

4 And all I am saying is much of the work,  
5 for instance, and since I live next to the University of  
6 Chicago I have no antipathy to it, but the chancellor's  
7 house was redone under urban renewal. And I don't think he  
8 was low or moderate income.

9 ALDERMAN O'CONNOR: Did you sign that  
10 authorization?

11 THE WITNESS: No. I partially made the  
12 appraisal but I made the appraisal. Any other questions?

13 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you very much, Mr.  
14 Hicks.

15 (Witness excused.)

16 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Mr. Larry Thompson.

17 L A R R Y T H O M P S O N  
18 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
19 as a Whole as follows:

20 THE WITNESS: It's a great pleasure to come  
21 before the body of Council as a citizen.

22 Economic development, as we all know,  
23 began through the access to land and tools. Without land  
24 and tools you cannot have economic development. Young

1 people today do not know anything today about how to take  
2 corn and make starch, make sugar, make oils and other  
3 products from this. They do not even know that corn comes  
4 from the land. We could use land for many things. We could  
5 take peppermint and make oil that can produce up to \$10,000  
6 a barrel out of this peppermint oil.

7 I suggest that the land that we have --  
8 the Board of Education has over 100 acres of farmable land  
9 to be used to train our youth to take land and the food  
10 products from it and develop moderate income from this to  
11 develop all the products that will provide them with food.

12 I also suggest that we use the parks, from  
13 one to ten acres of that land on the parks, to produce these  
14 food products in the City of Chicago. You cannot give a man  
15 a fish and expect for him to eat it for the rest of his  
16 life. You have to teach that man to fish and he will eat  
17 for the rest of his life.

18 I suggest that we give our youth the tools  
19 and access to this land in order to train them to be better  
20 citizens of this world. I also suggest that we relandscape  
21 the vacant lots in these blighted areas to make playgrounds  
22 for our youth, for wherever a building is torn down that the  
23 contractor take this land and landscape it, smooth it out so  
24 our youth will not break their knees and ankles on these

1 organizations for which I represent that the Year IX  
2 Community Development Block Grants Fund Program come close  
3 to truly representing the needs and desires of the  
4 neighborhood than any other previous years.

5 One thing I want to point out to this  
6 Council is that it is very clear to us in the community that  
7 many of the people that we elect think they got here on your  
8 own. Most of you got here with the support of the  
9 communities. You all got here because you promised to  
10 represent the people, represent the constituents. You all  
11 have not done anything since the Mayor was elected Mayor of  
12 Chicago.

13 I pose to those opposing forces on the  
14 City Council that those of us in our communities will not  
15 allow it, we will not continue to come to these Council  
16 meetings time and after time after time and watch you all to  
17 try to destroy our city and destroy our money. We believe  
18 that's what's happened.

19 We understand that in the previous years  
20 there were never an attachment between the legislative  
21 authority of this body and the administrative power of the  
22 Mayor. You all do not administer Community Block Grant  
23 money. And for you all to begin to try to remove from us  
24 control of that now is a serious mistake, because the

1 decision makers that operate those programs are the ones  
2 that monitor those programs, the ones that make sure the  
3 money gets into the communities. And they're the agencies  
4 that make sure the money is not misappropriated.

5 In closing, I -- and to make it clear to  
6 the 29 alderman, we will not be hostile by the Community  
7 Development Block Grant money. We're in strong support of  
8 the Mayor. We elected Mayor Washington for reform in City  
9 government. We did not elect politicians to act like  
10 they're deformed. Thank you.

11 (Witness excused.)

12 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Sadie Porter, Metropolitan  
13 Arts Center. The next witness will be William Frederickson,  
14 Advisory Committee Subcommittee on Economic Development.  
15 Mr. Frederickson, would you like to come forward? Miss  
16 Porter.

17 S A D I E P O R T E R  
18 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
19 as a Whole as follows:

20 THE WITNESS: Greetings to the Council. I  
21 bring you greetings from the Metropolitan Arts Center. My  
22 name is Sadie Porter. I am the director.

23 The support given to this project was  
24 developed as a special group of youth from two years of age

1 through college in need of art, culture and education. This  
2 will begin the process of preparing youth for their college  
3 education and career development. And, hopefully, they will  
4 return to repay other little boys and girls.

5           The broad member of unwanted, abused,  
6 awkward children in the Metropolitan Arts Center today is  
7 difficult in finding sufficient homes for them in the  
8 specific project. These young people will be cared for by  
9 retired senior citizens in a housing commune, which will  
10 produce one big, happy family atmosphere, thus combating  
11 crime, prostitution, gangs, alcoholism and many other social  
12 ills in our community.

13           The hiring range and providing new jobs  
14 will be according to the Illinois Department of Children and  
15 Family Services Guidelines, Section 358.181. They will  
16 include retired school teachers, social service workers 55  
17 years and older. Through this hiring there will be also  
18 expertise availability, constant volunteers and nurses and  
19 married couples are in our priority. These are mostly  
20 seniors to expand their expertise from a mature viewpoint to  
21 the maturation of a group of children in their progress into  
22 their careers. Seniors will be motivated to become  
23 interested in life again.

24           We're asking the Council to have

1 compassion, mercy in your heart. Please help us help the  
2 children.

3 (Witness excused.)

4 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Mr. Frederickson. William  
5 Frederickson. Miss Marion Samples. She spoke already.

6 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: She spoke. And she was  
7 great, too.

8 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Hazel Palmer. The chamber  
9 will be in order, please.

10 H A Z E L P A L M E R

11 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
12 as a Whole as follows:

13 THE WITNESS: I have my one minute speech. But  
14 I never knew it was so difficult for 50 adults to sit  
15 quietly and respectfully and listen to individuals of the  
16 public speak. And I am a product of the Chicago Public  
17 School System.

18 My name is Hazel Palmer, associate acting  
19 chairman of the Chicago Black United Communities.

20 It is clear that there has been a problem  
21 and perhaps an illegal use of funds previously allocated to  
22 Chicago for community development during the Byrne  
23 administration. It is clear that under this new  
24 administration of City government that many efforts will

1 issue forth to maintain the line on the part of the City  
2 Councilmen who intend to see to it that communities and the  
3 people will not have sufficient use of block grant monies.  
4 A single Council member, the pattern that may be of exerting  
5 such control or in the community development programs and  
6 those who work to implement them will always be on a  
7 collision course with what I call an unfair majority.

8           As a broad base community action  
9 organization, the officers and members of Chicago Black  
10 United Communities state and uphold the position that, one,  
11 Chicago has communities and has crucial issues which warrant  
12 the largest possible allocation for community development.  
13 And that toward this need and this end, every Councilman  
14 should move, plan and vote collectively to guarantee that  
15 application made for some that will meet the needs according  
16 to the guidelines and priorities and which will not linger  
17 with political overtones.

18           There are certain neighborhoods which  
19 require top consideration in terms of quality deterioration  
20 and in terms of repair, streets out, crossways; and in terms  
21 of honest and nonpolitical attempts to curb and prevent  
22 crime, in terms of more assistance to senior citizens, and  
23 in terms of more programs actually and adequately trained  
24 and prepare more citizens to return to the acts of

1 neighbors; three, there should not be as many spectacular or  
2 special programs as those that were formerly and obviously  
3 being done to impress, when these spectacles were only being  
4 done to benefit these politicians and and their followers.

5 Four, both the Mayor and the advisory  
6 council and perhaps a broad base citizens committee with  
7 representatives from neighborhoods, agencies and  
8 organizations across the City should be respected enough and  
9 respectable enough to grant the room to do the greatest  
10 uplifting for those of the city with the greatest need.

11 The time has come in Chicago for all  
12 citizens and for all political representatives to march to a  
13 better opportunity of community and harmony. The ills of  
14 the City can be healed if and when, and I quote, "it is  
15 honestly attested to that there are problems which require  
16 more than a Band-Aid solution for badly separated sores."

17 Harmony can be reached if and when the  
18 political leaders of Chicago come to the realization of the  
19 fact that some -- and when too many of the masses are  
20 hurting for too many traditions that eventually become too  
21 miserable to bear, that this large mass is not only set in a  
22 society which buckles and suffers and often destroys itself  
23 from the weight of such a burden but we're also the part of  
24 the society that pays for this continual B.S.

1                   It is within this context then that we  
2 appeal to the aldermen of the City of Chicago to apply new  
3 energy and insight in the employment and passage and the  
4 application of these community grant funds which will allow  
5 us to stabilize and thrive by what is done, in terms of  
6 development and growth.

7                   The Chicago Black United Communities will  
8 work diligently to see that people are placed above parties  
9 and machines. Thank you.

10                  CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you very much.

11                               (Witness excused.)

12                  CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Mr. Clarence Shaw, Drake  
13 Block Club, 24th Ward.

14                               C L A R E N C E   S H A W

15 called as a witness herein, testified before the Committee  
16 as a Whole as follows:

17                  THE WITNESS: I thank you to the Chairman, the  
18 Aldermen and the people in the rostrum. My name is Clarence  
19 Shaw from the west side.

20                               I am here because it's an insult that this  
21 money is not being spent on the people that need it. We  
22 ain't going to talk about white and black. We're going to  
23 talk about Chicago. And stop this political talk, all that  
24 29 stuff, 24 stuff.

1                   We ain't no black or white. This is  
2 Chicago. We have got to stop playing games. We put Harold  
3 in to change.

4                   Alderman Vrdolyak, if you want to live,  
5 you better come on with us.

6                   Now, I am going to tell you about 1921  
7 South Drake. We don't get no money for playing politics.  
8 You are living off our blood and it's poor whites, it's poor  
9 blocks, it's Mexicans and it's women, and I am getting  
10 tired. I ain't worried about Harold. I will stand on my  
11 own.

12                   But I am going to tell you 29, don't play  
13 with my money. I got my babies and my wife and I got to  
14 live. We want some decent housing on the west side. We got  
15 senior citizen eating canned food while you eat caviar.

16                   I want my kids educated. I want them to  
17 get proper training where they can get decent jobs, take  
18 them off relief. Put them on decent work programs. Teach  
19 them how to be policemen, plumbers. Teach them how to use  
20 their hands.

21                   We all want decent places to live. We  
22 ain't looking for no handouts. You are living off my back.  
23 You are sucking my blood. And your talking big words don't  
24 mean nothing 'cause it ain't but one Chicago and if you love

1 it, you better move.

2 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: The next witness is --

3 THE WITNESS: Any questions?

4 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: I have a question.

5 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Vrdolyak.

6 THE WITNESS: You have got a question. You are  
7 right.

8 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: I'd just like you to  
9 explain what you said, I better worry about living. Is that  
10 what you said?

11 THE WITNESS: That's not what I said. I made  
12 it clear to him.

13 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: We have had a good session.

14 THE WITNESS: He asked me. I am going to answer  
15 him.

16 Number one, you are voted by the people.  
17 Right now how are you going to separate poor black from poor  
18 white and poor Hispanic?

19 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: What are you talking about  
20 me living?

21 ALDERMAN BURKE: Ask the court reporter to read  
22 it back.

23 THE WITNESS: I am talking about you sucking  
24 our blood, taking our money and not giving us nothing.

1 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: That's not what you said,  
2 sir. I am suggesting, Mr. Shaw, that you shouldn't threaten  
3 anybody, least of all anybody in this Council or anybody  
4 else. Please, sir, don't threaten anybody. Don't threaten  
5 me either.

6 THE WITNESS: You are political.

7 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you very much.

8 THE WITNESS: You don't understand.

9 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Take your best shot, buddy.

10 ALDERMAN BURKE: Take your best shot.

11 (Witness excused.)

12 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Henry.

13 ALDERMAN HENRY: Alderman, I apologize for Mr.  
14 Shaw. I think Mr. Shaw is a very outstanding citizen in the  
15 24th Ward. And I think he has a right to express himself in  
16 any manner he sees fit.

17 I don't think he meant to threaten anybody  
18 in this City Council. I think the people will not threaten  
19 anyone, not Mr. Shaw. And I applaud the constituents from  
20 the 24th Ward for making themselves so clear.

21 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Mr. Chairman. Mr.  
22 Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Vrdolyak.

24 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: I never thought I would see

1 a day in this Council when another Council member would say  
2 that after what that man said. We have a court reporter, we  
3 have a tape recorder.

4           You know what the man said. Don't give me  
5 that bull. You are just trying to cover your butt. Don't  
6 do that. People who do that don't work with me. And that's  
7 not right. I'd be the first one to jump up and defend you.  
8 You are out of line.

9           ALDERMAN HENRY: Mr. Chairman.

10          CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Henry.

11          ALDERMAN HENRY: I resent being called out of  
12 line. I heard what the young man said. I understood him  
13 without the threat.

14          ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Read it back. Read that  
15 back.

16          CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Thank you, Aldermen.  
17 Ladies and gentlemen, that concludes the list of witnesses.

18               Is there anybody in the audience who  
19 wishes to testify before we conclude that phase?

20               Hearing a request for no other witnesses,  
21 we will conclude that part of the hearing. Now we ask the  
22 members --

23          ALDERMAN BURKE: Take a roll call right now.  
24 Here's the two amendments.

1 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: I would ask the members to  
2 remain in the chamber. We are waiting for a report, a very  
3 important report. We are going to remain in session because  
4 we hope to have it here in just a few minutes. So we  
5 suggest you occupy yourself the best you can.

6 We will remain in session until the report  
7 gets here. And it is my hope it will be here very shortly.

8 ALDERMAN OBERMAN: Mr. Chairman.

9 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Yes, Alderman.

10 ALDERMAN OBERMAN: If I remember the procedure  
11 we followed yesterday, would it be in order for the  
12 Committee of the Whole to rise and then for the Council --

13 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: No.

14 ALDERMAN OBERMAN: Can I just finish? And then  
15 for the Council to recess for a few minutes, while we're  
16 waiting?

17 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: No. First of all, the  
18 Committee cannot recess.

19 ALDERMAN OBERMAN: No. I said for the  
20 Committee as a Whole.

21 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: To recess the Committee  
22 and then convene and start the whole cycle over, because  
23 the whole --

24 ALDERMAN OBERMAN: Is there some action for the

1 Committee as a Whole?

2 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: You are perfectly free to  
3 discuss the two measure before us. Maybe we can be at ease  
4 for a few minutes.

5 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: That's it, at least for a  
6 few minutes.

7 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Does any member wish to  
8 discuss the two measures before us? It is perfectly in  
9 order. Otherwise, be at ease and we will wait for the  
10 report. And that will give Alderman Henry and Alderman  
11 Vrdolyak a chance to shake hands.

1                   CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Committee will come to  
2 order. We concluded the public hearing aspect of our  
3 Committee of the Whole and the testimony and questioning by  
4 the Aldermen. We received an additional communique from the  
5 Mayor. I would like for the record now, for the Clerk to  
6 read the first of the communiques in this particular record,  
7 the two that are now before the Committee of the Whole.

8                   THE CLERK: "Ladies and gentlemen, at the  
9 request of the Acting Budget Director, I transmit herewith  
10 an ordinance authorizing the submission of the final  
11 statement of the Community Development Block Grant  
12 Entitlement to the Federal Department of Housing and Urban  
13 Development under the Appropriations Act of March 24, 1983,  
14 Public Law 98-9, Federal Emergency Jobs Act of 1983.

15                   Your favorable consideration of this ordinance  
16 will be appreciated. Very truly yours, signed Harold  
17 Washington, Mayor."

18                   "Ladies and gentlemen, at the request of  
19 the Acting Budget Director, I transmit herewith an ordinance  
20 authorizing the submission of the final statement for the  
21 Year IX Community Development Block Grant Entitlement to the  
22 Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development under  
23 the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as  
24 amended.

1                   Your favorable consideration of this  
2 ordinance will be appreciated."

3                   CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: I will now hand the clerk  
4 the third communique received by the Chair and ask the clerk  
5 to read it.

6                   THE CLERK: "The Honorable City Council, City  
7 of Chicago, ladies and gentlemen, I transmit herewith an  
8 ordinance providing for development of guidelines and  
9 procedures for the allocation of funds made available to the  
10 City of Chicago pursuant to the 1983 Emergency Jobs Bill  
11 Community Development Block Grant in the Year IX Community  
12 Development Block Grant Program.

13                   Your favorable consideration of this  
14 ordinance will be appreciated. Very truly yours, signed  
15 Harold Washington."

16                   CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: The clerk will read the  
17 communique.

18                   ALDERMAN BURKE: Mr. Chairman, I move the  
19 waiving of the reading. We have all received copies.

20                   CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: It's been moved that we  
21 dispense with the reading of the correspondence. I believe  
22 everyone has a copy of the ordinance transmitted by the  
23 Mayor.

24                   We have available to us this evening, Mr.

1 David Schultz, the Budget Director, Mr. William Pierce the  
2 Assistant to the Mayor, Mr. Montgomery, the Corporation  
3 Counsel of the City of Chicago.

4 VOICES: Ware. Ware

5 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Bill Ware. David Epstein,  
6 Bill Harte, Irwin Jann, attorneys for --

7 (Outburst of Laughter.)

8 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: -- and they are available  
9 here for any questions that any member might have.

10 ALDERMAN HUMES: We have none.

11 ALDERMAN BURKE: No questions.

12 VOICES: No questions.

13 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Hearing no questions --

14 Yes, Alderman Orbach.

15 ALDERMAN ORBACH: I do have a question of Mr.  
16 Schultz. In reference to Section 7, we are talking about  
17 the Mayor having discretion to award C.D. funding under the  
18 amounts of \$50,000 at the Mayor's discretion. What within  
19 this document, what within this ordinance would prevent a  
20 stringing together of several \$45,000 grants. I would like  
21 the explanation on the record?

22 ALDERMAN FROST: The statute.

23 MR. SCHULTZ: Nothing, Alderman, other than  
24 the fact that we have also subscribed under Paragraph 5, to

1 provide a quarterly report on the obligation of the funds,  
2 so that the Council would be in the position to review the  
3 quarterly report, determine that we have done that, and take  
4 appropriate actions and sanctions at that time.

5 ALDERMAN ORBACH: So you are saying we  
6 wouldn't really be aware of whether there is a stringing  
7 branch going on for at least 89 days?

8 MR. SCHULTZ: We have also said --

9 ALDERMAN ORBACH: We only hear about it every  
10 three months.

11 MR. SCHULTZ: Under Section 6, my office shall  
12 develop and implement a procedure for notifying Aldermen of  
13 projects contemplated under this program. So therefore, an  
14 individual alderman who found projects being quote, unquote  
15 strung together, would have the opportunity to discuss it  
16 with this colleagues whether that happened.

17 Now, Alderman, the City of Chicago  
18 can't -- it's very difficult for the City of Chicago to  
19 avoid a contract unless in 89 days as many of you know, so I  
20 think that the quarterly reporting procedure will provide  
21 sufficient safeguards. We will prepare the quarterly  
22 report. We are prepared to come back and testify at that  
23 time, if there is any questions of any member of the Council  
24 concerning that report. If you find this kind of practice

1 going on, you are certainly going to be able to subject me  
2 and other members of the administration to a very close  
3 scrutiny and hold us accountable for our actions.

4 ALDERMAN ORBACH: Would you believe that would  
5 be in violation of the letter of the ordinance?

6 MR. SCHULTZ: I don't believe that would be in  
7 violation of the letter of the ordinance.

8 ALDERMAN ORBACH: In something that's strung  
9 together?

10 MR. SCHULTZ: I do not believe it would be in  
11 violation of the letter, that's correct. I believe it would  
12 certainly be a violation of the security ordinance and would  
13 prove to be a violation of the spirit under which the  
14 members of the Council have agreed to set aside their  
15 differences to consider this important matter of business.

16 ALDERMAN ORBACH: Just as one final question,  
17 in relation to granting of grants to different corporate  
18 entities, not-for-profit corporate entities with  
19 interlocking directorships, would that also fall under the  
20 stringing together aspect?

21 MR. SCHULTZ: In other words, if there was --

22 ALDERMAN ORBACH: If there were a whole bunch  
23 of not-for-profit corporations, same person is the director  
24 of all of them?

1 MR. SCHULTZ: Clearly, I would interpret that  
2 to not be in violation of the letter of this ordinance but I  
3 would interpret it to be in violation of the spirit that we  
4 worked together with, and I will assume I would be subject  
5 to the same sort of sanctions as I would if it was the same  
6 contract.

7 ALDERMAN ORBACH: At this point, I would ask  
8 you to maybe take note of that, I want you to make a note of  
9 that and have the criteria for the approval of such grants  
10 reflected. I would appreciate that.

11 MR. SCHULTZ: Your comments are duly noted, and  
12 they will be taken into consideration, Alderman.

13 ALDERMAN ORBACH: Thank you.

14 ALDERMAN FROST: Mr. Chairman.

15 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Yes, Alderman.

16 ALDERMAN FROST: Section 7, and this question  
17 is directed to anyone who might be able to give an answer,  
18 according to the fourth sentence, or the third sentence,  
19 that, "Such review shall be completed in not more than 15  
20 days after submission to the Council." Now, what is the  
21 intent of that language and what is the consequence if it's  
22 not completed in more than 15 days?

23 MR. WARE: Alderman Frost, the intent of this  
24 language is to reflect that these are often funds in

1 which -- for spending which is emergency in nature; that  
2 there are funds which must be expended and used within a  
3 program year. The idea was to give to the Council adequate  
4 time for review, but to allow the award to be made, if the  
5 Council does not choose to act.

6 It's been pointed out that there may be a  
7 technical problem which could arise if two members moved to  
8 defer and publish, but I believe the understanding is that  
9 that would be controlled by the ability to simply call a  
10 special meeting.

11 ALDERMAN FROST: So failure of the Council to  
12 act within 15 days would be deemed a waiver; is that  
13 correct?

14 MR. WARE: That's correct.

15 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Mr. Chairman.

16 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Vrdolyak.

17 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Mr. Ware, the Council  
18 Committee receives it within 15 days, acts, forwards it to  
19 the Council voting no, the Council receives it, votes no,  
20 what is the next action on the part of the budget office?

21 MR. SCHULTZ: I can conceive of two  
22 circumstances, Alderman, on the competitive bid contract.  
23 If the City Council votes no, I would recommend to the City  
24 Purchasing Agent that all bids be withdrawn, that the

1 project be advertised. On a non-competetive contract, I  
2 would attempt to ascertain the reasons for the Council's  
3 objections, if the Council objected to a particular  
4 contractor, we have to try and work out an accommodation.  
5 But clearly, our alternative, in all cases, I believe, would  
6 be to withdraw the contract and possibly submit the same  
7 contract for reconsideration or submit a different  
8 contractor for -- to perform the same function.

9 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Thank you for that  
10 information. I was thinking it would be more so in the  
11 direction if the Council based its rejection upon difference  
12 in criteria, question of criteria.

13 ALDERMAN OBERMAN: I couldn't hear the  
14 question.

15 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: I said if the Council did  
16 it on the basis of question of criteria, questioning the  
17 fact that the grant was within the criteria.

18 MR. SCHULTZ: If the Council basis its  
19 objection on the question of criteria, and it's not a  
20 contract that has a specific award limit, I would withdraw  
21 the contract. I would come to the Council and I would  
22 discuss in attempt to resolve the matter of the criteria,  
23 the difference of opinion of the criteria.

24 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Mr. Evans.

1           ALDERMAN EVANS: Mr. Chairman. During our  
2 hiatus, it was pointed out on Page 2, the fourth line from  
3 the bottom, the word Committee would be changed to Council.  
4 Has that been done?

5           ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: We did on the original.

6           ALDERMAN EVANS: It's done on the original?

7           ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Yes, it's a typo.

8           CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Any other questions?

9           ALDERMAN FROST: And there is another on the  
10 same page, Section 6, the second line that the Aldermen --  
11 we would insert all projects in there respective --

12          ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Mr. Chairman.

13          CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Alderman Vrdolyak.

14          ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Alderman Frost, of course  
15 it's open to discussion. There was a lot of dialogue about  
16 it, and we found out there were a lot of emergency matters  
17 such as fixing of a furnace for \$150 or some other minor  
18 matters involving people in emergency situations, that it  
19 might be a very difficult bookkeeping and administrative  
20 problem to give us copies of all; whereas any projects of  
21 significance, we would be getting in a natural way, so we  
22 thought maybe we would leave it out.

23          ALDERMAN FROST: Permit the language to remain  
24 as --

1 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Without objection, unless  
2 there is objection of Council.

3 ALDERMAN FROST: No objection.

4 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: The Chair would like to  
5 take this opportunity to thank Bill Ware, Mr. Schultz, Mr.  
6 Montgomery, David Epstein, Bill Harte, Irwin Jann, and the  
7 several aldermen for hammering out an acceptable compromise  
8 agreement, and if possible, a vote on the first substantive  
9 legislative proposal by the new administration.

10 Chair recognizes Mr. Vrdolyak.

11 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: I move due pass on the  
12 ordinance submitted today by the Mayor and ask for a roll  
13 call vote.

14 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: It has been moved that the  
15 Committee of the Whole reports, all three ordinances to the  
16 City Council --

17 VOICE: All three?

18 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Unless there is an  
19 objection.

20 ALDERMAN FROST: Why don't you have the motion  
21 to have all three ordinances to be consolidated for purposes  
22 of voting quorum?

23 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: For the purposes of a  
24 single vote.

1 ALDERMAN NATARUS: Mr. Chairman.

2 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Yes, Mr. Natarus.

3 ALDERMAN NATARUS: I would request a separate  
4 roll call.

5 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: All right. I move due pass  
6 of the ordinance that's been submitted, the last ordinance  
7 we received today, concerning the procedural efforts of the  
8 City Council and the Mayor's office, Council Committees and  
9 I am asking for the roll call vote.

10 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: You all heard the motion.  
11 Roll call has been called for.

12 Clerk, call the roll call.

13 THE CLERK: Roti?

14 ALDERMAN ROTI: Aye.

15 THE CLERK: Rush?

16 ALDERMAN RUSH: Aye.

17 THE CLERK: Kenner? Evans?

18 ALDERMAN EVANS: Aye.

19 THE CLERK: Bloom?

20 ALDERMAN BLOOM: Aye.

21 THE CLERK: Sawyer?

22 ALDERMAN SAWYER: Aye.

23 THE CLERK: Beavers?

24 ALDERMAN BEAVERS: Aye.

1 THE CLERK: Humes?

2 ALDERMAN HUMES: Aye.

3 THE CLERK: Hutchinson?

4 ALDERMAN HUTCHINSON: Aye.

5 THE CLERK: Vrdolyak?

6 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Aye.

7 THE CLERK: Huels?

8 ALDERMAN HUELS: Aye.

9 THE CLERK: Majerczyk?

10 ALDERMAN MAJERCZYK: Aye.

11 THE CLERK: Madrzyk?

12 ALDERMAN MAJERCZYK: Aye.

13 THE CLERK: Burke?

14 ALDERMAN BURKE: Aye.

15 THE CLERK: Brady?

16 ALDERMAN BRADY: Aye.

17 THE CLERK: Langford?

18 ALDERMAN LANGFORD: Aye.

19 THE CLERK: Streeter?

20 ALDERMAN STREETER: Aye.

21 THE CLERK: Kellam?

22 ALDERMAN KELLAM: Aye.

23 THE CLERK: Sheahan?

24 ALDERMAN SHEAHAN: Aye.

1 THE CLERK: Kelley?

2 ALDERMAN KELLEY: Aye.

3 THE CLERK: Sherman?

4 ALDERMAN SHERMAN: Aye.

5 THE CLERK: Stemberk?

6 ALDERMAN STEMBERK: Aye.

7 THE CLERK: Krystyniak?

8 ALDERMAN KRYSTYNIAK: Aye.

9 THE CLERK: Henry?

10 ALDERMAN HENRY: Aye.

11 THE CLERK: Marzullo? Nardulli?

12 ALDERMAN NARDULLI: Aye.

13 THE CLERK: Wallace Davis?

14 ALDERMAN WALLACE DAVIS: Aye.

15 THE CLERK: Smith?

16 ALDERMAN SMITH: Aye.

17 THE CLERK: Danny Davis?

18 ALDERMAN DANNY DAVIS: Aye.

19 THE CLERK: Hagopian?

20 ALDERMAN HAGOPIAN: Aye.

21 THE CLERK: Santiago?

22 ALDERMAN SANTIAGO: Aye.

23 THE CLERK: Gabinski?

24 ALDERMAN GABINSKI: Aye.

1 THE CLERK: Mell?

2 ALDERMAN MELL: Aye.

3 THE CLERK: Frost?

4 ALDERMAN FROST: Aye.

5 THE CLERK: Kotlarz?

6 ALDERMAN KOTLARZ: Aye.

7 THE CLERK: Banks?

8 ALDERMAN BANKS: Aye.

9 THE CLERK: Damato?

10 ALDERMAN DAMATO: Aye.

11 THE CLERK: Cullerton?

12 ALDERMAN CULLERTON: Aye.

13 THE CLERK: Laurino?

14 ALDERMAN LAURINO: Aye.

15 THE CLERK: O'Connor?

16 ALDERMAN O'CONNOR: Aye.

17 THE CLERK: Natarus?

18 ALDERMAN NATARUS: Aye.

19 THE CLERK: Oberman?

20 ALDERMAN OBERMAN: Aye.

21 THE CLERK: Hansen?

22 ALDERMAN HANSEN: Aye.

23 THE CLERK: McLaughlin?

24 ALDERMAN McLAUGHLIN: Aye.

1 THE CLERK: Orbach?

2 ALDERMAN ORBACH: Aye.

3 THE CLERK: Schulter?

4 ALDERMAN SCHULTER: Aye.

5 THE CLERK: Volini?

6 ALDERMAN VOLINI: Aye.

7 THE CLERK: Orr?

8 ALDERMAN ORR: Aye.

9 THE CLERK: Stone?

10 ALDERMAN STONE: Aye.

11 THE CLERK: Chairman Pucinski?

12 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Aye.

13 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Vote on this motion is 48  
14 ayes, no nays. The ordinance is adopted; mover reported to  
15 full Council.

16 Chair recognizes Mr. Stemberk.

17 ALDERMAN STEMBERK: I move to reconsider the  
18 vote by which this ordinance is passed.

19 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: The parliamentarian  
20 advises us it's not necessary, Alderman Stemberk.

21 Chair recognizes Alderman Vrdolyak.

22 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Burke or Frost.

23 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Chair recognizes Alderman  
24 Frost.

1 ALDERMAN FROST: I move the adoption of the  
2 ordinance on the Jobs Bill.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Same roll call.

4 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Motion has been made for  
5 the same roll call. Any objections?

6 (No response.)

7 So ordered.

8 Chair recognizes Alderman Burke.

9 ALDERMAN BURKE: Mr. Chairman, I move the  
10 adoption of Year IX Development Community Block Grant  
11 Ordinance.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Same roll.

13 CHAIRMAN PUCINSKI: Same roll call has been  
14 called for. Any objections?

15 (No response.)

16 So ordered.

17 There being no further business before the  
18 Committee of the Whole, the Committee will now rise and  
19 report back to the full Council its findings and  
20 recommendations.

21 (Whereupon, a short interruption  
22 was had.)

23 MAYOR WASHINGTON: Council will come to order.  
24 President recognizes Alderman Pucinski.

1                   ALDERMAN PUCINSKI:    Thank you, Mr. Mayor.   Mr.  
2 Mayor, reporting to the Committee of the Whole, which have  
3 been in consideration of three ordinances submitted by the  
4 Mayor for the Block Grant Program for 1983, the Jobs  
5 Program, and a further perfecting ordinance on the ordinance  
6 on the provisions incorporated.

7                   The first ordinance, the Committee  
8 reported -- the Committee of the Whole reports the three  
9 attached Ordinances to the City Council and recommends their  
10 adoption.

11                   MAYOR WASHINGTON:   Any discussion?

12                   ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK:   Question.

13                   VOICES:   Roll call.

14                   MAYOR WASHINGTON:   Roll call on the adoption of  
15 the report?

16                   ALDERMAN PUCINSKI:   Mr. Mayor, I presume a  
17 roll call on all three?

18                   MAYOR WASHINGTON:   Yes, on adoption of all  
19 three ordinances proposed by the members the Council of the  
20 Whole.

21                   Proceed.

22                   THE CLERK:   Roti?

23                   ALDERMAN ROTI:   Aye.

24                   THE CLERK:   Rush?

1 ALDERMAN RUSH: Aye.

2 THE CLERK: Kenner? Evans?

3 ALDERMAN EVANS: Aye.

4 THE CLERK: Bloom?

5 ALDERMAN BLOOM: Aye.

6 THE CLERK: Sawyer?

7 ALDERMAN SAWYER: Aye.

8 THE CLERK: Beavers?

9 ALDERMAN BEAVERS: Aye.

10 THE CLERK: Humes?

11 ALDERMAN HUMES: Aye.

12 THE CLERK: Hutchinson?

13 ALDERMAN HUTCHINSON: Aye.

14 THE CLERK: Vrdolyak?

15 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: Aye.

16 THE CLERK: Huels?

17 ALDERMAN HUELS: Aye.

18 THE CLERK: Majerczyk?

19 ALDERMAN MAJERCZYK: Aye.

20 THE CLERK: Madrzyk?

21 ALDERMAN MADRZYK: Aye.

22 THE CLERK: Burke?

23 ALDERMAN BURKE: Aye.

24 THE CLERK: Brady?

1 ALDERMAN BRADY: Aye.

2 THE CLERK: Langford?

3 ALDERMAN LANGFORD: Aye.

4 THE CLERK: Streeter?

5 ALDERMAN STREETER: Aye.

6 THE CLERK: Kellam?

7 ALDERMAN KELLAM: Aye.

8 THE CLERK: Sheahan?

9 ALDERMAN SHEAHAN: Aye.

10 THE CLERK: Kelley?

11 ALDERMAN KELLEY: Aye.

12 THE CLERK: Sherman?

13 ALDERMAN SHERMAN: Aye.

14 THE CLERK: Stemberk?

15 ALDERMAN STEMBERK: Aye.

16 THE CLERK: Krystyniak?

17 ALDERMAN KRYSTYNIAK: Aye.

18 THE CLERK: Henry?

19 ALDERMAN HENRY: Aye.

20 THE CLERK: Marzullo? Nardulli?

21 ALDERMAN NARDULLI: Aye.

22 THE CLERK: Wallace Davis?

23 ALDERMAN WALLACE DAVIS: Aye.

24 THE CLERK: Smith?

1 ALDERMAN SMITH: Aye.

2 THE CLERK: Danny Davis?

3 ALDERMAN DANNY DAVIS: Aye.

4 THE CLERK: Hagopian?

5 ALDERMAN HAGOPIAN: Aye.

6 THE CLERK: Santiago?

7 ALDERMAN SANTIAGO: Aye.

8 THE CLERK: Gabinski?

9 ALDERMAN GABINSKI: Aye.

10 THE CLERK: Mell?

11 ALDERMAN MELL: Aye.

12 THE CLERK: Frost?

13 ALDERMAN FROST: Aye.

14 THE CLERK: Kotlarz?

15 ALDERMAN KOTLARZ: Aye.

16 THE CLERK: Banks?

17 ALDERMAN BANKS: Aye.

18 THE CLERK: Damato?

19 ALDERMAN DAMATO: Aye.

20 THE CLERK: Cullerton?

21 ALDERMAN CULLERTON: Aye.

22 THE CLERK: Laurino?

23 ALDERMAN LAURINO: Aye.

24 THE CLERK: O'Connor?

1 ALDERMAN O'CONNOR: Aye.

2 THE CLERK: Pucinski?

3 ALDERMAN PUCINSKI: Aye.

4 THE CLERK: Natarus?

5 ALDERMAN NATARUS: Aye.

6 THE CLERK: Oberman?

7 ALDERMAN OBERMAN: Aye.

8 THE CLERK: Hansen?

9 ALDERMAN HANSEN: Aye.

10 THE CLERK: McLaughlin?

11 ALDERMAN McLAUGHLIN: Aye.

12 THE CLERK: Orbach?

13 ALDERMAN ORBACH: Aye.

14 THE CLERK: Schulter?

15 ALDERMAN SCHULTER: Aye.

16 THE CLERK: Volini?

17 ALDERMAN VOLINI: Aye.

18 THE CLERK: Orr?

19 ALDERMAN ORR: Aye.

20 THE CLERK: Stone?

21 ALDERMAN STONE: Aye.

22 MAYOR WASHINGTON: The motion to adopt the  
23 Committee of the Whole's report relative to the three  
24 submitted ordinances, there are 48 ayes, no nays, and the

1 motion is adopted.

2 Alderman Pucinski?

3 ALDERMAN STEMBERK: Mr. Mayor, I move to  
4 reconsider the vote by which these three ordinances have  
5 been passed.

6 MAYOR WASHINGTON: Alderman Stemberk moves to  
7 reconsider. Alderman Pucinski moves to table. All in  
8 favor, signify by saying aye.

9 ALDERMAN FROST: Motion to question.

10 ALDERMAN VRDOLYAK: No, no, put the question.

11 ALDERMAN PUCINSKI: Motion of Mr. Stemberk is  
12 to reconsider. I move that the same roll call prevail.

13 OUTBURST: No.

14 OUTBURST: Put the question.

15 MAYOR WASHINGTON: All in favor of the motion  
16 to reconsider, signify by saying aye.

17 (Chorus of ayes.)

18 Opposed?

19 (Chorus of nays.)

20 Motion to reconsider is lost.

21 ALDERMAN PUCINSKI: I move the adoption of the  
22 three reports as recommended by the Committee of the Whole.

23 MAYOR WASHINGTON: I think we are done,  
24 Alderman. We proceeded and adopted --

1                   ALDERMAN PUCINSKI:   We adopted the report, the  
2 Committee report. It's my understanding we now have to vote  
3 on the ordinance itself.

4                   VOICE: No, we did.

5                   MAYOR WASHINGTON: The report of the Committee  
6 was, in effect, the motion to adopt, and then they were  
7 adopted.

8                   Alderman Frost.

9                   ALDERMAN FROST: Mr. President, Members of the  
10 City Council, I move the City Council adjourn.

11                  MAYOR WASHINGTON: Any discussion?

12                                   (Chorus of nays. )

13                   Do you want a roll call?

14                                   (Outburst of laughter.)

15                                   (Which were all the proceedings  
16 had on the meeting of the City  
17 Council on April 26, 1983.)